

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

THURSDAY, 25th FEBRUARY, 1926

Vol. VII—No. 23

OFFICIAL REPORT



CONTENTS

Motion for Adjournment—

Hunger Strike by the Bengal State Prisoners in the Mandalay Jail—Leave granted.

Statement of Business.

Deaths of Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar and Sir Muhammadbhai Hafibhai

Election of a Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways

Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways.

The Railway Budget—*contd.*

List of Demands—*contd.*

Demand No. 4.—Working Expenses: Administration—*contd.*

(i) Indianization of the Railway Services—*contd.*

(ii) Provision of Electric Lights in Carriages in the Moradabad-Gajrola-Chandpur Branch of the East Indian Railway.

(iii) Unpunctuality of trains on the Central Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway, etc.

(iv) Reduction of Third Class Fares on Railways.

Motion for Adjournment—

Hunger Strike by the Bengal State Prisoners in the Mandalay Jail—*Adopted*

DELHI

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS

1926

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 25th February, 1926.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock,
Mr. President in the Chair.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

HUNGER STRIKE BY THE BENGAL STATE PRISONERS IN THE MANDALAY JAIL.

Mr. T. C. Goswami (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sir, I seek your permission to move for the adjournment of the business of the Assembly to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, and that definite matter of public importance is the serious situation in Mandalay Jail caused by the political prisoners from Bengal having gone on hunger-strike, in the light of the hitherto unpublished evidence before the Jail Committee of 1919-20 regarding the opinion of certain authorities with regard to the inhuman treatment of political prisoners in jail in previous years which has this morning been made public. Sir, I seek your permission to move the adjournment of the House on this issue, and if the Honourable the Home Member opposes it, I will explain my reasons in greater detail. Otherwise I shall wait till I move my motion of adjournment.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member): I do oppose it formally, Sir, because the matter was brought to my notice yesterday, and I have endeavoured to get full information as to the actual facts which I have not yet been able to do. That is as regards the hunger strike. As regards the publication of certain evidence which has been linked with the hunger strike, I do not see that that can be a matter of public importance. I merely oppose it on the ground that I shall not be in a position to give a proper reply on the question of the hunger strike.

Mr. President: The fact that the Government is not ready to give a proper reply to the question raised by the motion for adjournment is no ground on which the Chair can disallow that motion. I hold that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order; but as the Honourable the Home Member has taken objection, I ask Members who are in favour of leave being granted to rise in their seats.

(A number of Honourable Members stood up.)

There are more than 25 Honourable Members in favour of the motion, and I therefore intimate that leave is granted to the Honourable Member. The discussion of the motion will be taken up at 4 o'clock.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member): With your permission, Sir, I desire to make a statement on the subject of the probable course of Government business next week. Honourable Members are aware that Monday, the 1st of March, has been appointed for the presentation of the second portion of the Budget. The state of Government business is such that we are obliged to put forward some business after the presentation of the Budget and the introduction of the Indian Finance Bill. Motions will probably be made for introduction of Bills dealing with the following subjects?

- (1) Cotton Industry Statistics,
- (2) Archaeological Trusts, and
- (3) Amendment of the Indian Divorce Act.

and thereafter motions will be made to take into consideration and pass the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill as reported by the Select Committee and to take into consideration and pass the following Bills:—

- (1) The Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill,
- (2) The Legal Practitioners Fees Bill,
- (3) The Madras Civil Courts (Second Amendment) Bill, and
- (4) The Delhi Joint Water Board Bill.

Thereafter a motion will be made to take into consideration the amendments made by the Council of State in the Madras Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill. The next motion will be to refer to Select Committee the Indian Bar Councils Bill. If time is available on the conclusion of Government business the motions of Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar and Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar for the amendments to the Standing Orders of which they have given notice will be taken. In order to give Honourable Members time to study the Budget papers, the House will not sit on Tuesday, the 2nd and Wednesday, the 3rd. Thursday, the 4th, and Friday, the 5th, have been allotted for the general discussion on the second portion of the Budget.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally (Siud: Muhammadan Rural): May I know, Sir, if the Honourable Member will give an indication as to what day will probably be allotted for the Frontier Province Resolution?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Yes, Sir. The Resolution on the Frontier Province will be put down on some date between the 18th and the 24th.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I know whether there will be any day allotted for non-official Bills?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: No, Sir.

DEATHS OF MR. T. V. SESHAGIRI AYYAR AND SIR MUHAMMAD BHAI HAJIBHAI.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer (Madras: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I wish to refer to the sad news which has been received this morning of the death of a very esteemed Member of the first Assembly—I refer to my old friend, the late Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar. After a very successful career at the Bar, he was appointed to the High Court in Madras and served with credit and distinction as a Judge of the High Court for a period of about seven years. After his retirement he was nominated by the Government as a non-official Member of the first Assembly. He took a keen interest in the business of the Assembly and was one of the leaders of the Democratic Party which was formed in the first Assembly. He devoted himself heart and soul to the business of the Assembly and his services were of great value and assistance to that Assembly. After the expiry of his term as a Member of the first Assembly, he devoted the remaining years of his life to public work. The work that he did as President of the Flood Relief Committee in Southern India after the devastation wrought by the unprecedented floods in 1924 was most valuable. He toured through all the affected tracts, and he did everything he could to bring relief to all those who suffered from the floods. If he had been spared longer, he would probably have done equally valuable services to the public. His loss is one which will be mourned by the public of Madras, which has lost a distinguished citizen, and to this House it is the loss of a highly esteemed Member who helped to build up its traditions. I wish to express my heartfelt sentiments of appreciation and sorrow at his death, and I am sure that my feelings will be shared by every Member of this Assembly.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): Sir, I whole-heartedly associate myself with what has fallen from my Honourable friend, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar. I should be failing in my duty, Sir, if, as a Member of the first Assembly, I did not say a few words on the matter. I had not the fortune of knowing Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar before, but I knew him well in the Assembly. His integrity, his patriotism, his high sense of duty, his intense desire to do his duty in the Assembly, his whole-hearted devotion to the work that he took up, the fact that he was the Leader of the Democratic Party, his fair sense of justice,—all these combined to endear him to all who came in contact with him. In short the more I saw and knew the late Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, the more I loved and respected him.

Sir Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: European): Sir, I desire to associate my colleagues and myself in the expression of great sorrow and regret at the loss the country has suffered in the death of Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar. As a Member of the first Assembly, I well recollect the great ability with which he led his Party. He was ever courteous and attentive to his duties. He commanded the greatest respect from all sides of the House; and that the country should be now deprived of his services is a great loss. I hope, Sir, you will convey to his family the expression of our grief at his death.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I request your permission to associate myself with all that has fallen from my Honourable friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer in respect of the sad loss which our country has suffered in the death of Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar. Sir, I had the good fortune of being his pupil and later

[Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar.]

on his colleague in many of the public activities with which he was associated before he was on the Bench, and I knew how well, how anxiously, he worked in the cause of the Congress during all the time he was at the Bar. After his retirement from the High Court his work in the Assembly has been of a character to which ample testimony has been borne already by his then colleagues in the House, and I feel sure, Sir, that if he was not able to be here in the next Assembly, it was because he had sustained a State office and became a retired Government servant. I have every reason to think, Sir, that had he been spared, he would have been able to render to our province and to the country great public services and I feel, Sir, that this House should give expression to the feelings of the great loss which we have sustained in his death.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas (Sind: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I also join with all the Honourable Members who have just now spoken about the sad loss the country has sustained in the death of Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar. My friendship with him dates back to the time when he graced with his presence the Indian National Congress which was held at Karachi in 1918. Soon after that he was appointed as one of His Majesty's Judges in the High Court of Madras, and his judgments reported in the Indian Law Reports commanded very great respect and admiration in my province. Then, he was also the leader of the Democratic Party of which I was a member. All that has been said about the services that he rendered, the integrity of his character, and his nationalism, I endorse completely. My great grief is that it was only recently, about a month or so back, I received a letter from him enjoining me to take a particular action in the matter of a certain public policy. It was therefore a rude shock to me just now to hear from Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer of this sad loss. I also join with Sir Darcy Lindsay in requesting you, Sir, after this House has recorded its vote on the subject, to convey the sense of grief of this Assembly to the family of the deceased.

***Maulvi Sayad Murtuza Sahib Bahadur** (South Madras: Muhammadian): Sir, it is my painful duty to associate myself with the previous speakers in the expression of my sorrow at the demise of a great friend of mine, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar. Not only did he belong to our province, Sir, but he belonged to the same district from which I come, Trichinopoly. Both my deceased friend and I were colleagues in the Madras Legislative Council under the Minto-Morley Reforms, when he represented the University of Madras and I represented the Muhammadian constituency. He was one who evinced much interest in the cause of the country; he was one, Sir, who did yeoman service in this Assembly by espousing the cause of Indians; he was one, Sir, who took an active interest in the recent floods which devastated the Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts. Such a loss we cannot forget; it is irreparable. He was an intimate and personal friend of mine, and so, Sir, I feel the intensity of this calamity all the more. With these few words, I resume my seat.

Lala Lajpat Rai (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, in the absence of the Leader of the Swaraj Party I want to associate that Party fully with all that has been said before about the late Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar. Personally too, I want to associate myself whole-heartedly with the remarks that have been made by previous speakers. In him India has lost

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

a son of great talents, of high character and one who was both able as well as dutiful, and we, on this side of the House, are all extremely sorry to hear this shocking news. We request the President of this Assembly to convey our grief to the members of the family of the deceased.

***Maulvi Abul Kasem** (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I had the honour of being one of the colleagues of Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar in the first Assembly and I join in the expression of my reverence to the memory of our departed friend. Although we met more intimately in this House, I had the honour and the privilege of knowing him some years back. As has been mentioned by my friend Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas, he was one of the active members of the Congress when it was in its infancy. Sir, we have been told that the law is a jealous mistress and she does not allow her votaries to do anything else, but Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, though he was in flourishing practice, had and did spare time for public work and public service. Sir, my regret is that we are losing one by one the stalwarts and what is more regrettable is that their places are not filled up. Sir, we have heard expressions of regret from all sides of the House and that speaks highly of the reverence and esteem in which our late friend was held. The news has come to us as a shock. While associating myself with all that has been said about Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, whose death we all mourn, I also want to bring to the notice of this House and to your notice, Sir, the sad death of an ex-Member of the first Assembly, I mean, Sir Muhammadbhai Hajibhai. He was the Sheriff of Bombay, a member of the Corporation of Bombay and as a Member of this House he did excellent service. Though born with a silver spoon in his mouth, he devoted himself to the service of his community and his country and his death is a sad loss not only to the Muhammadans of Bombay but to the Muslim community and to the people of India in general. I hope, Sir, my colleagues here will join with me in my request to you to forward an expression of our sympathy and regret at his sad death to the members of his family.

The Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail (Madras: European): Sir, it has come as a great shock to me to hear of the death of Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar. I have been associated with him during the past 17 years in educational matters, as he took a very prominent part in all the University affairs in Madras. Although we differed sometimes, yet we remained good friends, and I can only say that I would like to associate myself with all that has been said in conveying the sympathy of this House to his friends and relations, and to express my own deep regret at the death of such a kind and cultured gentleman.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to associate myself with all that has been said about Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar and I do not think I need add anything more to the tribute of praise that has already been paid by other Members. To add to our misfortunes we have the shocking news of the death of Sir Muhammadbhai Hajibhai, who was a Member of the last Assembly and who was a sitting member of the Bombay Municipal Corporation. Sir, as a colleague in the Bombay Municipal Corporation, I came into the closest contact with Sir Muhammadbhai Hajibhai. In fact, we were sitting together at the meetings of the Corporation day by day. And I take this opportunity of stating that a more generous heart never beat in a human body. Sir, he

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

[Mr. Jammadas M. Mehta.]

was a Muhammadan, but he was Indian in sentiment and Indian in ideas. I know that he made no distinction of race or creed and to the younger members of the Corporation the late Sir Muhammadbhai Hajibhai was like a father. He was generous to a fault and Sir Muhammadbhai Hajibhai's like will not be seen for many many years to come either in the city of Bombay or anywhere else.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member): Sir, the Assembly has, indeed, suffered two heavy losses to-day in the death of two of its former distinguished Members, one from the Presidency of Madras and the other from the Presidency of Bombay, and we lament the loss of those men, who having held high office, came forward and took their part in political life. As regards Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar I only made his acquaintance when he came here in the first Assembly. But any of those who met him even once could not have failed to have been struck by the extreme charm of his manner and his great personal courtesy. He was a most picturesque figure. He seemed to me cut like an Italian cameo. I think there were few who had dealings with him who were not impressed with the personality of one who always struck me as being the truest type of Southern India gentleman. As regards Sir Muhammadbhai Hajibhai, I regret that I do not recall his personal acquaintance. But from his distinguished career and from the very high terms in which he has been referred to by my Honourable friend Mr. Jammadas Mehta I feel that in him also the House has lost a great man. I associate myself and those behind me in the expressions of regret that have fallen from Honourable Members, and I join with them in requesting that you, Sir, will communicate the feelings of the House to their bereaved families.

Mr. O. Duraiswami Aiyangar (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, if I have tried to catch your eye so often to-day on this motion it is because I feel that I will not be justified in keeping silent on this occasion without referring to a matter in which I have been particularly obliged to the late Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar. That is a service which he rendered to the public which has not been referred to till now to-day and it is for this reason that I now rise to speak. Sir, out of the Tirupati Temple funds two high schools and a Sanskrit college have been maintained. By a single stroke of the pen the Madras High Court declared them to be illegal expenditure of temple funds, and the next day both the two high schools and the Sanskrit college had to be closed. On that occasion I approached the late Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar and he ushered into the Madras Legislative Council a Bill called the Tirupati Devasthanam Schools Bill and worked so vigorously over it that, even after he was elevated to the bench of the High Court when the Bill was still pending before the Madras Legislative Council, he lent me all his personal influence both to see that the schools were not closed but maintained during the pendency of the Bill in the Legislative Council and to aid the successful passage of the Bill into law. It was due to him that the Bill soon passed into an Act. That, Sir, gave the first statutory recognition in this country to the surplus funds of a religious institution being utilised for objects of public interest by the application of cypress doctrine. That is a matter, Sir, which is also known to Sir Sivaswami Aiyer because he was then a Member of the Executive Council of Madras and he also had his part in getting that Bill passed. I feel personally

obliged to him in that connection and I can never forget the occasion when he worked heart and soul with me in the maintenance of the schools throughout that intervening period, when the Devasthanam withheld all its support on account of the judgment of the High Court. And we now find, Sir, on the Madras Legislative Council Statute-book an Act which will always make him immortal in the memories of the public of Madras. Sir, I therefore feel that I am personally bound to associate myself with all the sentiments that have been expressed in this Assembly by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and other speakers.

Mr. President: I am sure Honourable Members of this House will permit me to associate myself with all the sentiments and feelings that have been expressed on this occasion. There is absolutely no doubt that the country, as a whole, and this Assembly in particular, have sustained a heavy loss by the death of these two distinguished public men and it will be my duty to communicate to the families of the deceased the condolences of this House.

ELECTION OF A PANEL FOR THE CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RAILWAYS.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I ask your permission to move two formal motions which are not on the Agenda paper. The first is as follows:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, a panel consisting of eight members from which six shall be selected to serve on the Central Advisory Council for Railways, as provided for in clause 6 of the Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly on the 20th September, 1924, on the subject of separation of Railway Finance."

Maulvi Abul Kasem (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I have a question to ask the Honourable the Commerce Member. The Railway Advisory Council is composed of members elected by this House and the Council of State and, as *ex-officio* members, members of the Railway Finance Committee. Members of the Railway Finance Committee form part of the Railway Advisory Council, but before the Finance Committee is elected, how can you constitute the Advisory Council?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member had better wait for my next motion which provides for the Railway Finance Committee.

The motion was adopted

ELECTION OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE FOR RAILWAYS.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, eleven members from the Assembly who shall be required to serve on the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, as provided for in clause 6 of the Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly on the 20th September, 1924, on the subject of separation of Railway Finance."

Sir, may I very respectfully in moving this motion draw the attention of the House to the suggestion made last year during the Budget debate

[Sir Charles Innes.]

by Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao, which suggestion has received the strong support of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, that, in order to secure continuity of personnel, the House should only consider the advisability of re-electing two-thirds of the existing Members.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: I may inform Members that, arising out of the motions which have just been carried, the office of the Assembly will be open to receive nominations up to 3 P.M. on Friday, the 26th February, and the elections, if necessary, will take place in this Chamber on Monday, the 1st March by the usual method, namely, the single transferable vote.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE.

Expenditure from Revenue—contd.

DEMAND NO. 4—WORKING EXPENSES: ADMINISTRATION—*contd.*

Indianisation of the Railway Services—contd.

Mr. President: Further discussion will now proceed on Mr. Mahmood Sahamnad Sahib Bahadur's motion:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 1,000."

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I am sure that Government have for some time realised what keen interest Honourable Members of this House do take in the question of the Indianisation of the railway services. If I remember correctly, last year, on the motion of my Honourable friend from Madras, a motion was passed which practically amounted to a vote of censure on the Government for not having given effect to the feelings of this House on this matter; and yet in spite of this fact it is very significant of the way in which the Railway Department respects the wishes and feelings of this House that there is absolutely no reference to this question of Indianisation in the budget speech either of my Honourable friend, Sir Charles Innes, or of my Honourable friend, Sir Clement Hindley, in the other place. Fortunately for us there is some reference to this question in the Administration Report issued by the Railway Board for the year 1924-25. In that Report in Chapter 5 a table is given which gives a statement showing the number of gazetted officers and officers of corresponding rank employed in Class I Railways on the 1st April 1925, as compared with the 1st April 1924. A careless reader of this statement is liable to be misled as to the exact pace of the process of Indianisation. It would appear at first sight, Sir, that out of an increase of 48 officers of gazetted rank 88 are Indians, 6 are Europeans, and there has been a decrease in the number of Anglo-Indians by one. So far as the net figure of increase is concerned, this figure is perfectly correct.

but, Sir, what is the real state of affairs? I see from the statement that the total additions to the gazetted rank is 87 and of this 87, Indians are 44, Europeans 36, and Anglo-Indians 7.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes (Member for Commerce and Railways): Will the Honourable Member kindly explain how he gets the figure 87?

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: Yes Sir. In this table the last column shows the decrease and increase. Take, for example, the Bengal Nagpur Railway. You find under the column "European" the figure *plus* 9, which means that 9 Europeans have been recruited to the service of the Bengal Nagpur Railway; so that if you add all these *plus* figures under the "European" column you find that 36 Europeans have been recruited, 7 Anglo-Indians and 44 Indians; so that out of a total recruitment of 87 officers, 44 are Indians, 36 Europeans and 7 are Anglo-Indians. I suppose my reading of the statement is correct. Therefore the percentage of increase of the Indian element in the gazetted rank is not really so great as would at first sight appear from this table.

Sir, the two great problems of Indianisation of the railway service are these: firstly, to enable Indians to rise from the lower to the higher subordinate grade, and secondly, to provide for the recruitment and training of Indians to the superior staff in the railway services. Sir, one of the excuses given by Government for the charge that Indianisation has not progressed as rapidly as this House would desire is the fact that there are no suitable Indians trained for these posts. The question, therefore, at the first stage of Indianisation resolves itself into this, what steps have Government definitely taken to establish suitable centres of training, so as to enable Indians of the lower subordinate class to rise to the superior subordinate grade, and also what has been done to facilitate the recruitment and training of Indians to the superior staff? Sir, my Honourable friend, Sir Clement Hindley, speaking yesterday in this House, said that very many Honourable Members did not perhaps realise the splendid work that is being done by the school that has just been opened at Chandausi. I confess that I personally do not know anything about this school at Chandausi at all, but if Honourable Members of this House do not know anything about what is being done by this school, or what is being done by Government to increase facilities for training Indians to qualify themselves for the superior staff, the mistake does not lie with the Honourable Members of this House, but it is due to the fact that we are not given any information on this point.

Sir, in the Administration Report for 1924-25 in paragraph 94 it is stated:

"The question of devising suitable means to enable Indians to rise from the lower to the higher subordinate grade was considered at a meeting of the Railway Board with the Agents of the principal railways, and the conclusion arrived at was that the main requisite was a definite scheme of training for the higher subordinate appointments."

A wonderful conclusion this that the Railway Board has arrived at after conference with the different Agents of the Railway Administration! They have come to the conclusion that the main requisite was a definite scheme of training for the higher subordinate appointments. May I ask

[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty.]

what has been done to inaugurate this definite scheme for training for the higher subordinate appointments? My Honourable friend is holding up some paper in his hand; I do not know what that paper is or what the contents of that paper are. One would naturally have expected that on a question about which, as I said, this House feels so strongly and so keenly, the Honourable Member for Commerce would at least have given some indication in his speech of what is being done in the matter. Sir, may I suggest to the Honourable the Commerce Member and the Honourable the Chief Commissioner for Railways that, if it is not possible, in the short debate that we may have to-day to give the exact details of what is being done by Government in this direction, the Railway Board should at least prepare a memorandum explaining in detail what is being done by them to increase the facilities given for training Indians so as to enable them to qualify themselves for the superior staff of the railway administration. I would suggest to the Honourable the Commerce Member and to my Honourable friend the Chief Commissioner to prepare such a memorandum and place it in the hands of the Honourable Members so that Members might judge for themselves whether, when the Honourable Commerce Member speaks of his efforts to increase the pace of Indianisation, he really means what he says. Sir, I am prepared to concede that the Government are actuated by an honest desire to increase the Indian element in the railway services

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Question.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: Personally I am prepared to take the word of the Commerce Member when he says he is actuated by an honest motive. I say I at least am prepared to take my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes at his word when he says he is honestly actuated by his desire to increase the Indian element in the railway services

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Thank you.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: But I would like him to tell this House categorically what definite scheme the Government have to increase the Indian element in the railway services. It is all very well to say that the Government have accepted the recommendations of the Lee Commission that ultimately 75 per cent. of the posts in the railway services must be manned by Indians; but I would like to know from my Honourable friend in how many years they expect to bring about this state of things, and what is the definite scheme that they are inaugurating, and what is the definite policy that they are pursuing in order to bring about this 75 per cent. Indian element in the railway services within a reasonable period of time? Sir, my Honourable friend the Commerce Member the other day quoted a statement made by the Honourable the Home Member in another place about the policy of Government with reference to the Indianisation of the services, and he quoted the statement of my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman that the door for Indianisation is not to be by the back door of supersession. Sir, I am sure I am voicing the opinion of Honourable Members of this House when I state that we on this side of the House do not desire to bring about Indianisation by supersession.

Sir, in asking for Indianisation, we are claiming justice, and we do not want to achieve this justice by doing injustice to those who are in service be they Indians or Europeans. (Hear, hear). So far as I am concerned, let me make my position perfectly clear and let me explain to my Honourable friend what I mean by honestly endeavouring to bring about Indianisation. It is this. So far as the posts to which appointments are made by promotion, I do not ask you to overlook the claims of any of your officers in your service, Europeans or Indians; by all means let every officer in the service attain to the higher grade in the natural course of promotion. Do not supersede any of your officers in the name of Indianisation. But for those appointments which are filled, not by the process of promotion, but by a process of selection, and for which a qualified Indian is available, you must unreservedly give the appointment to the Indian and not to any European; and in the matter of initial recruitment you must practically stop European recruitment until the necessary proportion of the Indian element is attained. That is, Sir, what I mean by bringing about Indianisation of the services. And if Government could assure us that they would follow this policy, I for one would be perfectly satisfied. Sir, when we are told that for certain posts and certain appointments suitable Indians are not available, that men who have undergone the necessary training are not available, we are not prepared to swallow that pill. Those of us who have observed the splendid work done by Indians even in very highly technical matters, as for example, in the great hydro-electric work at Mysore, which is entirely manned and conducted by Indian officers.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): It is not entirely manned by Indian officers.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: Have you been to Mysore, Sir? Then you have not observed what is being done there.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Yes, I went to the hydro-electric installation by myself and was shown over by the Australian engineer in charge.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly; Non-Muhammadan Rural): Is the Honourable Member aware that for a long time an Indian was in charge?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I was speaking of the present.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: Those of us who have observed the efficient way in which the hydro-electric works at Mysore are being worked by a staff which I may safely assert is *predominantly* Indian (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "Hear, hear.") are not prepared to swallow this pill. Sir, when it is a question of appointing an Indian for a particular post the question is raised whether he has undergone so many tests and so many years of service which will qualify him for the particular job; but when it is a question of appointing a member of the heaven-born service to a particular job no such criterion is applied; an I. C. S. officer is fit for any job in the world. The other day, when I was asking about the successor of Mr. Sim, my Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett said that there was no Indian who, by training in that particular line, had qualified himself to fill that post. But that same criterion was not applied when Mr. Sim himself was appointed to that post. How

[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty.]

long, Sir, did Mr. Sim undergo an apprenticeship in the Railway Board and how long did he serve as an apprentice in studying railway finance? But my Honourable friend Mr. Sim belongs to that heaven-born superior service. The fact that he is an I. C. S. man would fit him for any job; he is fit to be the Financial Commissioner for Railways; he is fit to be the Chief Commissioner, he is fit to be the Member for Industries and Labour; Sir, he is fit for any job under the sun

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Not a lawyer's job.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: He is fit to be a lawyer too. When the Law Membership falls vacant I would not be surprised if my Honourable friend Mr. Sim got that job.

Mr. Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadian): Is he fit to be a Swarajist?

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: No, he is not fit for that. Sir, when we were talking yesterday about the Lee Commission's recommendations in connection with the Railway Department, we heard a good deal about a certain bargain. We were told that the Company-managed Railways had agreed to the policy of Indianisation provided the Lee concessions were granted to their officers. But, Sir, I would submit to my Honourable friends on the other side that the question of Indianisation, to which the Government stand committed, does not date merely from the Lee Commission Report. May I remind my Honourable friends on the other side, that in the Preamble to the Government of India Act, and in the pronouncement of the Secretary of State made in the House of Commons in August 1917, it has been declared that it was the policy of His Majesty's Government to increase the association of Indians in every department of the administration of this country. Sir, the question of Indianisation does not rest on any bargain. The question of Indianisation did not arise with the Report of the Lee Commission. I would request my Honourable friends on the other side kindly to remember this. Sir, as I said at the outset, I am prepared to believe that Government are trying their best to increase the Indian element in the Railway services; but I would like my Honourable friend the Commerce Member to tell us exactly and categorically in how many years they expect to bring about this proportion of 75 per cent., and what steps they have so far inaugurated and what policy they propose to follow in bringing about that state of affairs.

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, as a member of the Central Advisory Council I am in a rather awkward position, because the Honourable the Commerce Member took us, the members of the Railway Advisory Council, into confidence over a scheme of recruitment for the higher services in the State-managed lines of India. Sir, the first report which is marked "Confidential and Provisional" was printed in March 1925, and we discussed it last year. The Honourable the Railway Member will recognise this report by the pink cover. Later on the colour of that cover was changed to blue, and this revised report was printed in June 1925, and was considered by us in the Central Advisory Council last autumn. Only the other day in connection with a question

which an Honourable Member asked in this House, the Honourable the Railway Member promised to publish this report in order to enable the House to discuss it. I make a grievance of the fact that this report has not yet been published and that we miss an excellent opportunity of discussing the provisions of the report. I have got both the reports in my hand, but unfortunately as both are marked "Confidential", I am precluded from referring to the contents of these two reports.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: (Meerut Division: Non-Muhaminadan Rural): Confidential for members only.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Yes. I do not know whether the Honourable the Railway Member is prepared to give us another opportunity, after publishing this report, to discuss its provisions. A good deal of the criticism that has been levelled at him to-day would, I think, have been met had these provisions been known to the Members before this discussion had commenced. But this scheme relates only to the State-managed lines and is confined to the question of Indianisation with regard to the higher services, that is to say, what is known as the Engineering and Superior Revenue Establishments. My Honourable friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao raised the question yesterday as to how far the Company lines were prepared to act in concert with the Railway Board in the matter of Indianisation. That is a very important question, and I would ask the Honourable the Railway Member to make a definite pronouncement to-day as to how the present position is in that matter. I know that it will be said that the Companies are, under the terms of their contract, free to adopt any scheme of recruitment they like. But, Sir, that reply will not satisfy me because the very terms of the contracts between the Secretary of State and the different Company lines provide that these terms will be subject to any legislation that may be passed by the Government of India; and if the Honourable the Railway Member finds that the Company-managed lines are not willing to fall into line with the State-worked Railways in regard to the question of Indianisation and the methods of recruitment, I would expect him to bring forward a Bill in this House to give effect to the demands voiced on this side of the House for the purpose of controlling the Company lines and compelling them to adopt what may be considered to be the best course in this matter. Sir, it is a well-known fact that our grievance in the matter of Indianisation is much more serious in connection with the Company lines, than in connection with the State-managed lines. I do not want to go into figures because the figures are in the hands of all Honourable Members here, and I do not think this fact will be disputed by the Government. I maintain that this deplorable condition of affairs, so far as the Company lines are concerned, is due not so much to the absence of properly trained Indians as to a sort of prejudice which they have against the entertainment of Indians as officers. Sir, I hold in my hand an advertisement that appeared not very long ago in an English newspaper in which the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company advertised for an Assistant Engineer, and the first qualification which that advertisement lays down is "Candidates must be of non-Asiatic descent". (Hear, hear.) I have got it here; if the Honourable Member wants to look at it, I will very gladly lend him this copy. I have seen many advertisements like this, and I do not think that they are so uncommon even to-day. Sir, I will repeat this illustration proves that the refusal of Companies to engage more Indians is due more to a prejudice against Indians

[Mr. K. C. Neogy,]

than to anything else. (*An Honourable Member*: "Racial prejudice.") I have papers with me about a candidate, an Indian candidate, who had taken his B.Sc. in India with distinction, had served an apprenticeship in the Locomotive Department of the East Indian Railway at Jamalpur for 21 months, and then had gone to Glasgow and qualified himself as an engineer there and had taken the B.Sc. degree in Engineering and after that had apprenticed himself in locomotive workshops in England for 2½ years—mind you, after having taken the B.Sc. degree in Glasgow—now when he came back to India he applied for an appointment as Assistant Loco. Superintendent to all the various railways. In reply, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway wrote to him—(I have got the letter with me here)—something to this effect: "Your qualifications fall short of the mark, and we can offer you an apprenticeship starting on Rs. 75 a month." Sir, that surely does not look as if Indians are having fair treatment. This person has since obtained employment in the State Railways. I may mention that the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in those days was a company managed line.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: They do not do it so crudely now.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: I do not know whether things have improved on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway since then. Now I come to the other part of the question. This discussion relates not merely to the recruitment for the Superior Establishments; because when we ask for Indianisation we demand Indianisation of not merely the superior establishments but also of the subordinate ranks of officers, with salaries, for instance, of Rs. 250 a month and upwards. But we are apt to forget that when we talk of the Lee Commission in this connection, the Lee Commission's recommendations had nothing to do with the question of Indianisation of the subordinate ranks. The Lee Commission's proposals were confined merely to the question of Indianisation of the Superior Engineering and Revenue Establishments, so far as the railways are concerned. Therefore it will not do for the Honourable the Railway Member merely to refer to the recommendation of the Lee Commission and to say that they are prepared to give effect to that recommendation. I expect him to make a definite statement to-day as to what his policy is with regard to the Indianisation of the subordinate ranks. Sir, we do not take our stand merely on the recommendations of the Lee Commission. Even the Acworth Committee's Report in paragraphs 182, 183 and 184 referred to the deplorable condition of Indians in the different railways. Sir, I do not want to tire the House by placing any extracts from those paragraphs before it, but I will read out only one recommendation which they made. They stated:

"We think the Government of India might consider the propriety of establishing a minimum percentage of Indians to be reached within a fixed period."

Sir, we are talking of 75 per cent. annual recruitment to be ultimately reached, if possible. That was the qualification which the Honourable the Finance Member added yesterday. Sir, here is a positive recommendation that "the Government of India might consider the propriety of establishing a minimum percentage of Indians to be reached within a fixed period." I take it what the Acworth Committee meant by "a minimum percentage of

Indians'' was the minimum of the total cadre in the different branches of the service. Sir, the Honourable the Railway Member has given effect very readily to those recommendations of the Acworth Committee which go to consolidate his own position and the position of the Railway Board. May I know why it is that this recommendation has been given the go-by so long? Sir, I think this recommendation of the Acworth Committee, although it was more in connection with the employment of Indians in the superior grades, has some reference also to the question of Indianisation of the subordinate establishment. Therefore, I want the Honourable the Railway Member to make a definite statement to-day whether it is intended that this recommendation of the Acworth Committee is to be given effect to, particularly in regard to the subordinate services in the railways, and also whether the Company Railways are going to be made to come into line with the State Railways, and whether recruitment for the superior establishments would be on a common basis, on a common standard and through a common agency.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I should first like to congratulate my Honourable friend Mr. Chetty on what I thought was a very excellent speech, and, I may say that Mr. Chetty's speech showed there was practically no difference between Mr. Chetty and myself. I do recognise that the House has a grievance in that I have not been able to publish the document to which my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy referred. I regret that fact very much because had I been able to, as I had hoped, publish that document and to make it available to the House before this debate came on, I am perfectly sure that it would have taken away a great deal of the edge of the debate. We have been working on this matter of the recruitment and training of railway officers in India for a considerable time. We first put an officer on special duty and that is the answer I give to Mr. Neogy as to what action we took on the Acworth Committee's suggestion. We put an officer on special duty. We got his report and having got his report, the Railway Board elaborated their scheme. That scheme was placed a year ago before the Central Advisory Council. They took objection to certain features of the scheme. Consequently we took the scheme back. We reconsidered it and last autumn we put a revised scheme before the Central Advisory Council, which scheme was accepted by them. Unfortunately in that scheme we made certain recommendations regarding the qualifications of the people we shall have to recruit at home, and therefore we had to send the whole matter up to the Secretary of State. We sent our despatch to the Secretary of State at the end of November last and, though I have no reason to suppose that he will in any way object to our proposals in regard to recruitment and training in India, we have not yet received his final approval and, in accordance with our standing rules I am not in a position to publish those papers. As I said, this is a matter of great regret to me. If I had been in a position to publish those papers, I am quite certain that the House would have been satisfied with the action we are taking in regard to the recruitment and training of railway officers in India.

I have been challenged both by Mr. Ramachandra Rao and Mr. Neogy and also by Mr. Chetty to say what we are doing and, if the House will hear with me, I propose to do so, because I think that it will interest the House. As the House knows, we divide our railway staff, our superior staff

[Sir Charles Innes.]

into four departments—Transportation and Commercial is the first department. The second department is Civil Engineering. The third department is Mechanical Engineering and the fourth is the Stores Department. Now, in regard to the first department, transportation and commercial, hitherto we have been rather haphazard, I think; in our methods of recruitment. We now propose to faithfully carry out the Lee Commission's recommendation to recruit 75 per cent. of the vacancies in each year in India and we propose to effect that recruitment in the following way. We are laying down certain qualifications. We think now that in view of our new system in our Transportation Department that even officers engaged mostly on traffic and the commercial side should have some knowledge of engineering or science so that they can understand the working of the operating department, and so we are providing for certain qualifications. We propose to advertise each year the number of vacancies we have and we propose to invite applicants. Those applicants will be subjected to a preliminary process of selection. Whether we shall have the selection made through the Local Governments or by the Railway Board is a matter which we have got still under consideration; but there is going to be a preliminary process of selection, and after that selection there will be a competitive examination. We are doing that quite deliberately because it is a thing that I personally am keen on and I wish to say publicly that in future it is no good for anybody to write to me and ask for jobs in these particular departments because we are depriving ourselves entirely of any kind of patronage.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Why preliminary selection?

An Honourable Member: That is indirect patronage.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: In view of what has been stated in regard to the technical qualifications, it is proposed to restrict selection in the first instance to persons holding the degree of an Indian University—any University in India—or a degree mentioned in Appendix V of a British University or the engineering certificate of the Thomason Civil Engineering College at Roorkee, provided that such degree or certificate include one or more of the following subjects. Applied Mathematics, Physics, Mechanics and Prime Movers. Those are our proposals in regard to recruitment for the Transportation and Commercial Departments. There will be a preliminary process of selection and then we shall have competitive examination among the selected candidates. As I said, whether the selection will be done, as in the case of the civil services, through the Local Governments or some other department or by the Railway Board is a matter that is still under consideration. Then, I come to the civil engineering side. At present the House may know we guarantee certain appointments, two appointments a year, I think, to Roorkee and one every alternate year to Sibpur. We have got to carry on our guarantees for the students already in those colleges, but we propose to withdraw the guarantee from a certain period. After that any person from a civil engineering college with the prescribed degree or certificate in India will be eligible for this department. Here also there will be a preliminary selection and then there will be an open competitive examination. Now, the most difficult of course is the Mechanical Engineering part. There our difficulties are greater and the fact remains that at present we are not in a position to turn out in India

fully qualified mechanical engineers for such departments as, say, the Loco and Carriage and Wagon Departments. There again this is the procedure which we propose to follow:

"Applications will be invited each year by advertisement and suitable candidates will be nominated by the Railway Board for the Mechanical Department and to form the Power Branch of the Transportation Department. Applicants must have passed the Intermediate Examination in Science or Arts or the Senior Cambridge Examination. Selected candidates will be appointed in the first instance as special class apprentices and will be required to undergo three years' practical as well as theoretical training in the State Railway workshops. At the end of this period they will be examined and if found suitable those nominated for the Mechanical Department will be required to undergo a further two years' training in the higher mechanical course at the Bengal Engineering College, Silpur, and will continue practical work in the workshops during vacation. Candidates for the Power branch of the Transportation Department will be transferred to the Running Department of a State Railway for two years, during which period they will be required from time to time to attend courses of instruction at the Railway school of transportation at Chandausi. They will receive stipends while under training in the workshops. On satisfactory completion of these courses they will be sent to England to undergo a further period of training for two years in the workshops in England."

Those are our proposals for the recruitment and training of officers for the three important departments of our Indian railways, that is to say, the Transportation and Commercial Department, the Civil Engineering Department and the Mechanical Engineering Department. We have also our training arrangements for the subordinate departments. We have already done a considerable amount for the training of subordinate technical staff:

"At Kanchrapara and Jamalpur technical schools are established which provide for the proper proportion of theoretical and practical training being given to apprentices during their five years' apprenticeship. A standard has been established for admission to apprenticeship in the examination conducted by the Bengal Board of Control of apprenticeship training. At Moghulpura (North Western Railway) a technical school exists which gives theoretical training to the apprentices and for the Great Indian Peninsula Railway workshops there is available the Victoria Jubilee Technical Institute. The Jamalpur and Kanchrapara schemes are devised so that at the end of three years' training it is possible for the better educated and more intelligent apprentices to proceed, after examination, to the Bengal Engineering College for a two years' higher mechanical course. Since 1917 a scheme has been in force on the East Indian Railway under which graduates in Engineering are selected for training, are given one year's intensive training in the Jamalpur Workshops and then sent to Great Britain for three years' workshop training. On satisfactory completion of training they are appointed to the Superior Service as Assistant Loco. Superintendents."

Now, Sir, as I say, I hope shortly to be able to publish these papers. I am not the Leader of the House and I am not in a position to offer any day to this House for discussion of it, but I will make them available and I shall be very glad to receive any criticisms or suggestions which Honourable Members may wish to make in regard to the scheme; and of course it is open to any Member to move a Resolution on the subject. As I have pointed out to the House the scheme is the scheme which has been approved by the Central Advisory Council for Railways after very prolonged discussion.

Now, Sir, I have been asked by several Members what we propose to do in regard to Company Railways. We propose to take up the question with them as to exactly how they propose to give effect to their pledge that they accept the Leo-Commissions recommendations. I have not the least doubt that all Company Railway administrations will carry out that pledge absolutely faithfully. But I am prepared to go further. The Honourable Mr. Joshi asked me yesterday whether it would be possible for us to put in the Administration Report each year a paragraph showing how many vacancies had occurred during the year in the different departments of the different

[Sir Charles Innes.]

Railways and exactly how those vacancies had been filled, whether by Europeans or by Indians. I am quite prepared to consider that suggestion and I hope that next year we shall be able to give information of that kind. That will enable the House and the Government to watch the progress of this policy. I should like to say quite definitely that it is a policy with which I entirely agree, and I associate myself with what Mr. Chetty has said that the Government should accept this policy not as part of a bargain. I recognize fully and always have recognized that in this matter of the public services Indians have a right to serve in the public services, in the Railways and other departments of the Government. It is quite true, and I am quite prepared to admit it, that in the Railways up till a few years ago they were very backward in this matter indeed. But on State Railways the figures I have given more than once show that in the last few years we have made a very great advance, and I now hope that in the next few years we shall be able to show a similar advance on Company Railways too.

Mr. Chetty complained that I made no reference to Indianisation in my budget speech. Sir, if I had made a reference in my budget speech to all the matters that I should have liked to have dealt with I should have made a speech to which no one in this House would have listened because it would have been too long; and quite definitely I omitted from that speech questions of this kind because I knew that I would have an opportunity of explaining the point of view and the attitude of Government on the Demands for Grants. It was not because I wished to conceal anything from the House or to suppress anything.

Now, Sir, I hope that I have answered the questions which I consider to be really important questions. I am not going into the past; I am concerned with the future. I hope I have answered to the satisfaction of Honourable Members their questions as to what we propose to do in regard to recruitment and training in India of this 75 per cent. of Indians which we are recruiting for our vacancies.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: The Honourable Member is talking about the recruitment for the superior services. May I ask him just to explain to this House what is being done to enable Indians who are already in the lower subordinate services to rise to the higher subordinate services?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am glad that my Honourable friend has raised that particular point. I can possibly best explain it in this way. I will take the Transportation and Commercial Departments; this is on State Railways. We expect that in those departments we shall have 10 vacancies a year. 2.5, that is, 2 in one year and 3 in the next, will in accordance with our proposals be recruited in England. The remaining 7.5 out of 10, that is, 75 per cent., will be recruited out here. Of these 6 will be direct recruits by competitive examination; 1.5 will be recruited by promotion from the subordinate services, the local services. We consider that we must provide that avenue for the subordinate services because the best way of getting efficient and good subordinate services is to give them some prospect of promotion to the higher services. Now, Sir, I think I have answered at any rate most of the important questions that have been raised, and I hope the House will recognize that whatever may be the record of Indian Railways in this matter in the past, at any rate they will have no reason to complain of their record in the future.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao (East Godavari and West Godavari cum Kistna: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I did not quite catch what the Honourable Member said in regard to Company-managed Railways. I gathered that he was going to take up the matter with them

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I said we were going to take up the matter with the Company Railways. What I hope the Company Railways will do is that they will come into this scheme of ours and that we shall be able to recruit 75 per cent. of the vacancies in the Company Railways in the same way as we recruit for State Railways—by one competitive examination possibly for all India, but I cannot promise that because we shall have to consult the Company Railways about it. But the Honourable Member may take it from me that we do propose to take up the whole question with the Company Railways as to what they propose to do to give effect to this pledge to fill 75 per cent. of the vacancies as they occur in India.

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indians): Sir, I am very sorry I did not catch your eye before the Honourable the Commerce Member spoke, because I had some figures which I wished to present to him for verification and explanation, figures which show the opposite or Anglo-Indian side of the Indianisation picture. Sir, Honourable Members on the opposite Benches have made certain statements regarding Indianisation and expressed certain fears as to its progressive fulfilment. I think the figures I am about to present will show that their fears are groundless and that the fears are more with the Anglo-Indian community which is being made to look upon Indianisation as “ex-Anglo-Indianisation”. If Honourable Members will look at Annexure B to the Explanatory Memorandum to the Railway Budget for 1924-25 and look at the column relating to that class of employees drawing Rs. 250 and over per mensem, they will find the following interesting figures.

In 1922 there were 544 Anglo-Indians and 232 Indians employed in this class. In 1923 there were 459 Anglo-Indians and 211 Indians employed. Now let us go a little further ahead. Sir, in 1924 you will find that there were 431 Anglo-Indians and 238 Indians. This means, Sir, that in this class, during these two years, 1922-24, 130 Anglo-Indians were dismissed on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and there was an increase of Indians. Go a stage further, look at page 65 of the Railway Administration Report for 1924-25. You will find that on the 1st of April 1924, there were 350 Anglo-Indians in this class, and on the 1st April 1925 there were 472. I ask the Honourable the Commerce Member to take particular note of the figure 350 Anglo-Indians on April 1st, 1924. Now there is evidently something wrong in these figures. We are told in this Book that on November 1st, 1923, there were 459 Anglo-Indians, and on the 1st of April 1924 there were 350, which means that within these five months over 100 Anglo-Indians were dismissed in this important subordinate class of service, i.e., 33 per cent. of the total of this cadre. Now, Sir, my confusion is rendered worse confounded when I tell you that within twelve months' time, that is from the 1st of April 1924 to the 1st of April, 1925, this total of 350 for some reason suddenly rose up to 472, that is an increase of 122 or 34 per cent. What am I to understand from these figures? It means that over 100 Anglo-Indians in this particular grade were dismissed from the 1st November 1923 to the 1st April 1924 and that these very men were re-employed by the 1st April 1925. I frankly admit, Sir, that I am very

[Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.]

perplexed by these figures and I seek information from the Government. But the mystery of these figures deepens when you look at the Administration Report and compare the total cost of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway establishment for corresponding periods. If you look at page 62 of the Administration Report, you will find that the total cost of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway establishment for the year 1923-24 was 463 lakhs and for the year 1924-25 it was 470 lakhs, that is to say there was an increase of one per cent., whereas the total number of subordinates employed in this class rose from 1,007 to 1,286—that is to say an increase of 28 per cent. Sir, it is well known that during the years 1922-24 the Great Indian Peninsula Railway retrenched in establishment to the total extent of 84 lakhs. Now from this medley of figures I should like to know what conclusions one is entitled to draw. I stand here as the representative of a community largely employed on the Railways in India particularly in this class of subordinates, a community whose grandfathers laid the first sleepers on this Railway, and whose grandchildren to-day form the backbone of it. There are only two conclusions one can draw, (a) either these figures are wrong and unreliable, or (b) the rates of pay of Anglo-Indians and Indians have been markedly reduced on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway; and as far as Anglo-Indians are concerned, this reduction has been made in direct contravention of the Manmad Pact, an honourable agreement entered into between the Agent and these men. Now, Sir, I submit that on the figures given by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway on this very important matter (a matter of vital importance to my community), that unless Government gives me an adequate explanation, I am entitled to charge the Great Indian Peninsula Railway with having deliberately dismissed Anglo-Indians and replaced them by Indians. I do not wish my Indian friends to think that I am raising a controversial matter on the physical fitness or claims of the two people. I am one with you in your demand for Indianisation but the selection must be carefully done. (Hear, hear.) I submit that it is against all the laws of justice and humanity that an Anglo-Indian, European, or Indian should be dismissed to give employment to another man, simply to carry out retrenchment and obtain economy, or to follow a policy that has been indicated by Government. I submit, Sir, that to replace those people who are working efficiently and who are in active service by another class, in the Government's desire to Indianize the Railways, is an unjust and an inhuman policy and ungenerous and ungrateful treatment to a community which deserves a better fate.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: Why assume that they were dismissed?

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Why assume anything else on the face of these figures?

Mr. M. V. Abhyankar (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): What about the time when they were first appointed to the exclusion of Indians?

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: I deny this original exclusive appointment. I am glad to answer the question put by my Honourable friend—I hope he does not object to my calling him the “Loud Speaker” of the Swarajist wireless set—a Member who hails from the land of oranges. He no doubt will readily admit that time was when the pay of railway employees was very meagre;—Rs. 80 to Rs. 100 or so—when cholera,

small-pox and malaria took their toll and employment on Railways was more or less an isolated existence; and when there of course were none of the social amenities as we know and enjoy them to-day, nor was the salary as attractive as it is to-day. During those dark and unpromising days Anglo-Indians manned the Railways and you elected to be transported by Anglo-Indian railway employees all over India.

Mr. M. V. Abhyankar: Did the Indians refuse to man the Railways then or were they excluded as they are to a great extent even to-day?

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: By constitutional agitation it was the Anglo-Indian employees who got the salaries raised to what they are to-day—so attractive that Indians now seek employment on Railways. I do not blame them claiming their share. But why want to replace me, when still in active service. Sir, regarding my figures I speak subject to correction. If they are correct, then I opine it is the official's sacrifice of his Anglo-Indian subordinates on the altar of retrenchment and economy. It is not right, Sir. Anglo-Indians are statutory natives of India, and as such, we claim equal treatment with all other Indian communities. Sir, *en passant*, one sees in all questions raised in this House, asking for a percentage of Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indians in various Departments, an objectionable and meaningless classification more or less encouraged by Government in their replies. (*Honourable Members:* "Come over to this side".) I did not select my seat but I am quite happy here. I strongly object, Sir, to this classification of Europeans, Indians and Anglo-Indians. If I am to be treated as a statutory native of India for occupational purposes, I submit Government should not encourage this classification. They should classify communities broadly as "Indians" or "Europeans". Sir, our status as statutory natives of India has been recently re-affirmed in the House of Commons by the Right Honourable Earl Winterton and that as statutory natives of India we possess all the occupational privileges as do the rest of Indians. In the face of this to dismiss Anglo-Indians, to get rid of them so as to make room for Indians, is, I submit, a decidedly wrong policy. Sir, no railway would dismiss its European employees like this. In this way I submit that the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, in the application of the Incheape axe, has ruthlessly axed my community. Sir, I ask the Government, with all respect and seriousness, to produce figures to show to this House and to me as the representative of my community in this House that I am wrong in my assumption, that I am wrong in my suspicion. If that is not forthcoming, Sir, I shall feel that my assumption is correct and that the figures I have produced are correct and I, therefore, place at the door of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway the charge of being one of the main causes for the daily swelling of the Anglo-Indian army of unemployed.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: May I ask the Honourable Member where the figures he has given come from?

Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: From page 65 of the Railway Administration Report for 1924-25. The other page is page 62. You will find on page 65, the column of those employed on a monthly salary of Rs. 250 and over, and here you will find that 350 represents the total number of Anglo-Indians employed under this heading. On page 62, you will find a yearly comparison of the cost of establishment of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Kumar Ganganand Sinha (Bhagalpur, Purnea and the Santal Parganas: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, many statistics have been quoted since yesterday for various reasons, particularly with regard to the motion before the House. I would also ask the indulgence of the House for quoting the statistics which, I am afraid, have not yet been quoted. I will draw the attention of the Honourable Member for Government to Appendix C of the latest Administration Report of the Railway Board. What do we find there? We find that no Indian has been appointed in the Agency Department of the Railways of which I will presently give a catalogue. The names of the Railways in which no Indian has been appointed in the Agency Department are the Assam Bengal Railway, the Bengal and North Western Railway, the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway; the Burma Railways, the Eastern Bengal Railway, the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, the Rohilkhand and Kumaon Railway, and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. That is not the only Department in which no Indian has been appointed in so many Railways. There are other Departments too and these are the Stores Department and the Locomotive and Carriage and Wagon Department. In the Stores Department, there is no Indian in the South Indian Railway, the Assam Bengal Railway, the Bengal and North Western Railway, the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, the East Indian Railway, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, and the Rohilkhand and Kumaon Railway. In the Locomotive and Carriage and Wagon Department, there is no Indian in the Bengal and North Western Railway, the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, the Burma Railways, the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, the Rohilkhand and Kumaon Railway and the South Indian Railway. What I cannot understand is the fact that when there are so many Railways in which Indians have been found qualified to hold these appointments, why these Railways have not seen their way to Indianise their superior services in these departments and I want to know from the Honourable Member on the Government Benches what they have done to see that these departments in the Railways which I have just mentioned are Indianised. I do not want to repeat the arguments that have been adduced on the floor of this House for Indianisation, because I feel that it would be unnecessarily taking up the time of the House. But I want to make it clear that I associate myself with every argument that has been advanced for Indianisation by this side of the House. With these words, I support the motion.

Colonel J. D. Crawford (Bengal: European): Sir, I rise to congratulate my friend Mr. Chetty on having called the attention of the House to what I believe is the correct method of making our policy of Indianisation a success. In so far as my own community is concerned, I do not think that we are concerned with the complexion of the administration so much as with the question of its efficiency. In so far as the interests of the whole country are wrapped up, as they must be, with her commerce and trade, it is obvious that we must maintain the efficiency of our Railways. Now, if we look around and observe many of our big industries in this country, both those managed by European and Indian, we find them going outside the country for a large number of their officers. Businesses are not philanthropic concerns; Railways are not philanthropic concerns; and they are not going to pay passages to and from England, higher salaries

for men brought from there, if they can get the requisite stamp of men that they require close at hand. That is a fact that remains; and therefore what this House ought to do regarding its Indianisation is constantly to press upon Government the necessity for training facilities, more training facilities and yet more training facilities, especially in regard to technical services. We have heard from the Commerce Member some of the measures which have been taken to provide those training facilities. So far as I can see there are not yet throughout the countryside adequate facilities for training, nor is the public mind yet in that stage, as Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal pointed out the other day, to send its sons to acquire the necessary knowledge which will lead them into services like the Railway. We want two things. We want more training facilities and we want that assistance from and the desire amongst the public itself which will secure for its own sons the training that would give them places in our technical services and make them fitted eventually to hold higher posts. I think my friend Mr. Chetty has done a great service to the House by drawing our attention once more to that aspect of Indianisation, to which I am not opposed in the least, and he is to be congratulated on that. I feel quite certain that neither the Government nor the Members opposite would ever lend their hand to doing injustice to those persons of my own community who are domiciled and belong to India. I feel quite certain they do not desire to see them prevented from serving in the services of this country or to see them turned out where they are performing useful work; and so I need not stress that particular point. All I wish to emphasise once again is the value of and the necessity for further training facilities. I think the Railway Administrations have done much in that direction, but there is still a lot more that could be done.

Lala Lajpat Rai (Juliander Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, this is a subject upon which Indian public opinion is very keen and very sore, and I may say at once that there is no section of Indians who can now remain satisfied with mere assurances. We do not question the motives or the intentions of Honourable Members on the other side who give us assurances. But of assurances we have had enough and to spare. We have been assured times out of number. As far back as 1858 we were assured in the proclamation of Her Majesty Queen Victoria that no distinctions of caste, colour or creed shall be made in appointments under the Crown, but we know what has been the result. What we want now are not assurances, but deeds (in Honourable Member: "Performances.") and the translation of those assurances into actual facts. What we see here is this, that in spite of the good intentions of the Honourable Members opposite, the situation remains from year to year practically the same. Certain changes are being introduced, I admit, but the process of Indianisation is so slow and the facilities given are so few that the complaint remains substantially the same as it has been in the years past. The gentleman on the other side who just sat down said that what we should do is to press for facilities for training. But he evidently ignores the fact that we have been pressing for facilities for training—at least vocally—ever since the Indian National Congress was founded in 1885. If you will turn over the pages of the annual reports of the Congress for all these years, you will find that this question of the Indianisation of the services and of training facilities for Indians has been engaging the attention of that body ever since it was founded and it still harps on the same string

[Lala Lajpat Rai.]

to-day. I am perfectly certain that with all the good intentions in the world, Honourable Members opposite will not be in a position to change the situation materially, unless and until the appointing authorities are changed and unless those appointing authorities are Indians themselves. With all the good intentions, Sir, the forces of circumstances and environment are so strong that when the time comes to translate these assurances into actual practice, somehow or other those intentions do not effectuate. That is what we see every day and I submit that no amount of assurances will be of any use or effective in changing Indian public opinion in this matter unless substantial steps are taken to translate the assurances into deeds. As regards railway services, these assurances are now being repeated year after year but how do matters stand? A careful perusal of the Railway Board's Administration Report for 1925 shows that the assurances are not translated into acts even when opportunities present themselves to the Honourable Members on the other side to do so. On page 63 of the Report of the Railway Board are given figures of increases and decreases in the higher services of the various Railways. In one of these columns, in the column reserved for Europeans, you will find that, while on the Bengal Nagpur Railway there are plus 9 of Europeans, there is only plus 1 of Anglo-Indians and plus 3 of other Indians. In the same way you will find that on the Bengal and North-Western Railway there are plus 4 of Europeans only. On the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, you will find plus 7 of Europeans and only plus 2 of Indians. On the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway you will find plus 5 of Europeans and minus 1 of Indians. On the South Indian Railway you find plus 11 of Europeans, minus 1 of Anglo-Indians and plus 5 only of Indians. So you find that when opportunities present themselves to Railway Administrations of giving new appointments to Indians, they are not utilised. It is very fine to talk of justice and efficiency. But justice and efficiency at whose cost? One of my Honourable friends on the other side, the leader of the Anglo-Indians, complained of the reduction in the number of Anglo-Indian employees on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. In a pathetic tone he pointed out that ever since the grandfathers of the present generation of Anglo-Indians laid the first sleeper on the Indian Railways, they have been the backbone of the Indian Railway management, but now the grandsons of those grandfathers are being pushed out of the railway services *en masse*. Following his example, I may very well say that the great-grandfathers of the present generation of Indians supplied the last pie of the money that was invested in the Indian Railways, their grandsons still continue to supply more money and pay the interest thereupon. Every pie of the monies spent on the Indian Railways is charged to the Indian revenues. And who pays these revenues? The Indians, of course. And what is the return they get? The vast bulk of the higher appointments go to Europeans and Anglo-Indians. Only the bones are thrown over to Indians. In the matter of treatment also, the Indians suffer considerably because the Europeans are favoured at their cost. It is not a question of efficiency so much as it is a question of rights. We do not claim anything as a concession. We demand our rights and in demanding those rights we put forward also as auxiliary arguments, the arguments of efficiency, economy and justice. I have before me certain statements prepared by responsible men, based on official reports of the Railway Department. One

of these statements has been prepared by the President of the All-India Trade Union Congress, in which, on pages 8 and 9, he has given figures of Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indians in the higher services of the Railways. What do we find there? According to the statistics of 1924, in the matter of appointments carrying a pay of Rs. 250 per mensem and others, the percentages of the different nationalities represented in these services were as follows:

Europeans	38.0
Anglo-Indians	87.77
Indians	24.14

In the same way, if you come to the subject of Indianisation in new appointments, you will find from the figures that the assurances given by Government have not been translated into deeds. From 1921-22 to 1923-24, 76 new appointments were made in the superior establishment. 32 of them went to Europeans, 23 to Anglo-Indians and only 21 to Indians. So, you will find that in spite of all assurances to the contrary and in spite of all promises, the state of things remains—I do not say exactly the same—but substantially the same. Therefore, we cannot be satisfied merely by assurances and promises. Something more is needed to satisfy public opinion in this country. I am perfectly certain that no amount of assurances will enable the Honourable Members on this side to change their present views unless there is a substantial change in the percentages of the personnel of the higher offices of those departments and that of the Railway Board in the direction of Indianisation. That is why we were so keen over throwing out the whole Demand for the Railway Board the other day. It was not an act of vengeance, nor one of vandalism. It was simply to show the strong feeling that exists in the country about this matter. Indians do not expect that anything like adequate justice can be done to them either in the matter of appointments to higher services or in the matter of the treatment of the Indian travelling public, unless the Railway Board has, at least, some Indian members on it.

Sir, I have got another statement with me which has also been prepared by a responsible Trade Union Officer, in which the figures of appointments and salaries of the subordinate staff on the Bengal Nagpur Railway are given. You will find, Sir, that only the lowest posts are given to Indians, carrying salaries which are hardly sufficient to enable them to keep their bodies and souls together. All the higher posts are practically reserved for Europeans and Anglo-Indians. Well, Sir, is this the value of those assurances of which we have been hearing so much? I will just read out to you one or two statements in order to establish my point. You will see that Indian drivers (class 2) start on Rs. 48 and go up to Rs. 58 after a period of 5 years, whereas European and Anglo-Indian drivers start on Rs. 165 and go up to

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I rise to a point of order, Sir? There is another motion on the paper which deals with the question of racial discrimination.

Lala Lajpat Bai: I submit that the two heads are similar. We complain of Indianisation, and the question of the difference in salaries also practically falls under the same category.

Mr. President: I appreciate the difficulty of the Honourable Member, but would it not be more convenient if he reserves his remarks about racial discrimination till the motion in that behalf is moved?

Lala Lajpat Rai: I will bow to your ruling, Sir, but may I point out that the claim for Indianisation is based on racial discrimination? The whole subject is one and you cannot divide it into two compartments. We are asking for Indianisation because we feel that there is racial discrimination in the making of these appointments and also in the salaries given, but I will bow to your ruling and will not pursue that subject.

Mr. President: I have given no ruling. I have only suggested it to the Honourable Member.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): Sir, most of us have spoken on this motion from the point of view of Indianisation. If Lalaji now raises this question, he will make our position very difficult because most of us would like to speak on that point but we shall have no right to speak on it.

Lala Lajpat Rai: I do not see the difficulty of my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi but I would very readily give way to him because he knows the subject much more than I do. I therefore wish to leave the field free and open to him when the subject of racial discrimination comes. So I will sit down after making only one more observation, leaving the subject of racial discrimination, the status and salaries of Indians as compared with Europeans and Anglo-Indians to be dealt with by Mr. Joshi. That observation is this, that it is the greatest irony of the situation that even Indians holding higher appointments are by the force of circumstances made to vote against their own interests in this matter. I see Indian gentlemen sitting on the opposite Benches who are being superseded by Europeans without any charge of inefficiency being brought against them, voting against their own interests and against our propositions. But they are helpless as we are helpless. The political situation is such that it demands and justifies all these anomalies and vagaries. I submit, therefore, that the amendment which has been moved ought to be made and I therefore support it.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkhand and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have no speech to make. I have only one word to say and that is to put a question to the Honourable the Member for Commerce, and it is this, that in reply to a question of mine last year the Honourable the Home Member stated in this House that in all the central services one-third of the posts would be given to Muslims. My question now is, whether in this scheme which the Honourable the Commerce Member has just revealed before the House, has any provision been made to give adequate representation to Muslims, as mentioned by the Honourable the Home Member?

Mr. Chaman Lal: Has he made any provision for Atheists, Jains and Hindus?

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: There are many sub-sections but I am not referring to them. You might as well ask whether any provision has been made for Sunnis, Shias, Moghals and Pathans and all the other sub-sections. This is absurd.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I think that I can answer Maulvi Muhammad Yakub at once. The Railway Board in matters of this kind are bound by the general policy laid down by the Government of India. I will read a sentence from the Report by the Railway Board. This particular sentence relates to the Transportation Department but applies equally to other Departments. Mr. Yakub will see that the point he has made has already been taken up. It says:

“Two-thirds (of the vacancies) will be made by means of a competitive examination of the selected candidates possessing the educational qualifications prescribed. Candidates standing highest in order of merit in the examination will to the extent of the number of vacancies available be offered appointments. The remaining one-third will be filled by nomination to correct communal inequalities, but before a candidate can be so appointed it is essential that he shall have passed the qualifying examination.”

That is to say, we do try to meet the point raised by my friend Mr. Yakub, but I wish to make it perfectly clear that in the Railway Department the minority communities, in order to get the benefit of that provision, must satisfy the proper standards of efficiency.

Nor, Sir, need I spend very much time over my friend Colonel Gidney, who referred to certain statistics relating to the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. From those statistics he deduced the fact that his particular community had been very severely treated by the Agent. It is a fact that in that particular year the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was not working at a profit. Drastic measures had to be taken and drastic reductions had to be effected. I can assure my Honourable friend that the Anglo-Indian community was not treated any worse than the other communities. Practically the same reductions were made in regard to Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indians proper.

Finally I come to my friend Lala Lajpat Rai. He wants deeds, not assurances. Well, Sir, I have already given the figures and do not wish to repeat them, but I must point out to my Honourable friend that these very statistics to which he referred show that the total staff on the Indian Railways increased by 43 net in the year 1924-25, and of that net increase of 43, 38 was the net increase in Indian appointments, superior appointments. Similarly, there was an increase of 436 in subordinates drawing more than Rs. 250 a month. That increase was made up as follows:

European	minus 8
Anglo-Indians	plus 163
Muslims	plus 43
Non-Muslims	plus 238

The net effect is that we are making progress, and I desire to challenge what my Honourable friend said that they will not get any change in this matter unless a change in the personnel of the Railway Board is made. I consider that as a reflection upon Indians. If we had all Indian Members on the Railway Board there would not be any change of policy in this matter. We have agreed to Indianise at the rate of 75 per cent. of vacancies as they occur. The present Members will carry out that policy, and I do not believe that any right-thinking man will challenge my statement that if we had Indians on the Railway Board they would do exactly the same.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 1,000."

The Assembly divided.

AYES—58.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
Ahmuzzaman Chowdhry, Khan Bahadur.
Ariff, Mr. Yacoub C.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Chaman Lall, Mr.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Das, Mr. B.
Deshmukh, Mr. R. M.
Duni Chand, Lala.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
Ghose, Mr. S. C.
Ghulam Abbas, Sayyad.
Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Ismail Khan, Mr.
Ivengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hosain.
Lajpat Rai, Lala.
Lohokare, Dr. K. G.

Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Mr.
Majid Baksh, Syed.
Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Sayad.
Mutalik, Sardar V. N.
Narain Dass, Mr.
Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Piyare Lal, Lala.
Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harhlas.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
Sinha, Kumar Gananand.
Talatuley, Mr. S. D.
Tok Kyi, U.
Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Vishindas, Mr. Harchandrai.
Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—45.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
Bajpai, Mr. R. S.
Bhore, Mr. J. W.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
Bray, Sir Denys.
Calvert, Mr. H.
Cocke, Mr. H. G.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.
Donovan, Mr. J. T.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A.
Gordon, Mr. R. G.
Graham, Mr. L.
Hayman, Mr. A. M.
Hazlett, Mr. J.
Hindley, Sir Clement.
Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
Hudson, Mr. W. F.
Hussainally, Khan Bahadur W. M.
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
Jaffer, Mr. K. S.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Macphail, The Rev. Dr. H. M.

Makan, Khan Sahib M. F.
Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
Muddiman, The Honourable Sir Alexander.
Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.
Naidu, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Neave, Mr. F. R.
Owens, Lieut.-Col. F. C.
Rahman, Khan Bahadur A.
Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
Roffey, Mr. E. S.
Setalvad, Sir Chimanlal.
Sim, Mr. G. G.
Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
Sykes, Mr. B. F.
Tonkinson, Mr. H.
Vernon, Mr. H. A. B.
Vijayaraghavacharyar, Sir T.
Wajihuddin, Haji.
Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was adopted.

Provision of Electric Lights in Carriages on the Moradabad-Gajrola-Chandpur Branch of the East Indian Railway.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sir, I move this amendment in order to point out that on the Moradabad-Gajrola-Chandpur branch of the East Indian Railway, old Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, we have still got, in the first and second class compartments, gas lights instead of electric lights. Sir, the danger of having gas lights in the trains has been exhibited more than once. Only a few years ago there was a collision on the old Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, near Moradabad, and as a result of that collision the gas holders burst and the train caught fire and more people lost their lives by being burnt than were injured by the collision. This system of having gas lights in trains is really very dangerous because, as soon as there is a collision, the gas holders burst and the carriages catch fire. If you have electric lights you do not have to meet that danger. Only in September last when we were going back from Simla to Moradabad, the train in which I was travelling had a severe accident. Five bogie carriages left the line and went about 100 yards into a field and the light-holders in my compartment were broken and fell down. As it was electric light no damage was done to the compartment which did not take fire, while if it had been gas light, the gas holder would have burst and the compartment would have caught fire. So I wish to draw attention to this matter and say that it is very dangerous to have gas lights and the railway authorities should take care that these gas lights, wherever they exist, are at once changed to electric lights. That is the only point for which I have raised this motion.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish to associate myself with the motion—not with the *gas* of the Honourable Member (Laughter) but with the light part of it. Mr. Muhammad Yakub comes from my constituency

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: He comes from my constituency and not I from his.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: A very intelligent interruption! However it is a perfect scandal that in these modern days, you should have such antediluvian lights.

The state of affairs on the Rohilkund and Kumaon Railway is absolutely disgraceful.

I do hope that the Honourable the Commerce Member will take this matter into consideration and put an end to a state of affairs which is worthy of a world before the deluge!

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: Sir, I do not come from Mr. Ranga Iyer's constituency, and I have no grievance against the railway company (Hear, hear) for having gas lights on the railway. I believe it is some years since orders were issued that all the carriages should be fitted with electric lights. I think every reasonable person like myself (Laughter) will agree that it will take a considerable time before all the carriages on the lines are fitted with electric lights. I think I am right when I say that it is only due to the number of carriages that so much time has been taken, and not with any deliberate purpose of burning the passengers by the railway company.

Sir Clement Hindley (Chief Commissioner, Railways): Sir, I think this complaint can be answered very simply and shortly but I would like to comment, before going on with the main question, on one thing which has just been said. It has been said that the use of gas in carriages is antediluvian and I think "scandalous" or something of that sort, probably scandalous was the word used—these terms do not come as readily to my lips as they do to those of some other Honourable Members. In a great many countries, Sir, gas is still used and is found to be very efficient. In England many trains are run with gas lighting, and on the Continent of Europe and in America too. It is not antediluvian; but it has been considered in this country that the risks of running with gas lighting are more than the risk of running with electric lighting. There is nothing antediluvian about it, or scandalous; there is no deep-seated design on third-class passengers in the use of gas lighting. It has worked very well for a great many years. We found there was a larger risk of danger than with electric lights and we definitely took up the policy of converting all our stock.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Has the Honourable Member travelled in one of those compartments, the lights in which only "make darkness visible"? (Laughter).

Sir Clement Hindley: I thought he was talking of gas-lighted trains; perhaps he is now thinking of oil-lighted trains. We definitely took up the policy of converting all our passenger stock for electric lighting. As one Honourable Member has said it is a very big matter to convert all our stock and it could not possibly be done all at once. We had to deal with each carriage as it came into the shops in the normal course for repairs and that in the ordinary course would be a process covering several years. I would like to assure the Honourable Mover of the motion, however, that the East Indian Railway is very nearly reaching the end of its work in converting these coaches. There is a provision of 2 lakhs in the Budget for this work during the coming year. I cannot give a promise that every carriage will be converted during this coming year but I believe that the whole work is very nearly approaching completion. I hope therefore it will be found that these gas-lighted coaches will gradually disappear in the very near future.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: Sir, in view of the statement made by the Honourable the Chief Commissioner of Railways I beg your leave to withdraw the motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Unpunctuality of Trains on the Central Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway, etc.

Syed Majid Baksh (Burdwan and Presidency Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I do not think I will be able to give even a pin-prick to the railway authorities by my modest demand for a reduction of Rs. 100 because I am confident that the Honourable Member has budgetted this amount many times over and he does not suffer in any way even by our carrying this motion. The fact that I was going to draw attention to yesterday and reserved consideration thereof is that there is a section among the railways managed by the Railway Board, a section of the Eastern Bengal State Railway called the Central Section, which hardly attracts the attention of the august body known as the Railway Board or the subordi-

nate body known as the Working Department. I therefore move this amendment:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sir, on this section the trains are proverbially unpunctual and hardly ever keep to the scheduled time; and although it is a single line I hope I may sufficiently express myself by saying the number of trains are so few that there has not been single collision for the last 30 years. That is how the trains are run on that section.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Kural): But is that an objection?

Syed Majid Baksh: That section has not yet engaged the attention of the Honourable Member. About this line I put certain questions to which I shall refer afterwards. Now there is a station on that line which is very important, and I hope my Honourable friend Mr. Sim will remember what I told him on the occasion I put that question. There is a very important station on that railway, which has this year sent by rail about two or three hundred thousand maunds of jute . . .

An Honourable Member: What is the name of the station?

Syed Majid Baksh: Jhicargachha Ghat station. As the name signifies it is a ghat station very near the bridge and there is no platform at that station and none has been erected for the last 20 years. The platform or wooden structure stands on the same level as the railway lines, and sometimes the bridge is taken by the travellers at night for a platform and as soon as they get down on the bridge and try to take a few steps they generally fall into the river.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: But just now you said there had been no accident for 30 years.

Syed Majid Baksh: I said there had been no collision; I did not say no loss of life. I spoke of no collision but there has been loss of life.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub: The railway authorities will see that there are some collisions in future!

Syed Majid Baksh: Now I put two questions about that and my Honourable friend Mr. Sim gave me an assurance that he would try to help me in the matter. The reply he gave—I do not remember what it was (loud laughter) but it was something like this: "The reply to (a) is in the evasive and the other does not arise." I am willing to withdraw this motion on receiving an assurance that my complaint will be looked into.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I should have been in a better position to deal with the Honourable Member's motion if he had let us know beforehand what his motion was going to be about. The three gentlemen who sit behind me have the most complete knowledge of the working of Indian Railways in all parts of India but I am afraid we cannot answer offhand questions as to particular points on a particular section of a particular railway. If the Honourable Member had had what I might almost call the courtesy of letting us know beforehand what particular point he was going to raise, I should have been able to answer him. As it is, he has taken us entirely by surprise.

[Sir Charles Innes.]

I understand his complaint is that the trains on a certain section of the Eastern Bengal State Railway are usually unpunctual. I venture to doubt whether that is so because the running of our trains is improving every year. And he also complains of a certain station being without a raised platform. I will certainly read the Honourable Member's speech when I see it in print, and that speech in the ordinary course will go to the Agent and I am quite sure, if the Agent is satisfied there is anything in the complaint made by the Honourable Member, he will look into it.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: May I point out to the Honourable Sir Charles Innes that he has not taken any notice of the Honourable Member's chief grievance, which was that there has been no accident for the last 30 years on that line! (Laughter.)

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Reduction of Third Class Fares on Railways.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 100."

My object in asking the House to make this reduction is to ask the House to give instructions to the Railway Board that the third class railway fares be reduced more than they have been reduced so far. Sir, I have made many speeches on this subject in this House and I do not wish therefore to be long in placing before the House the reasons why I ask for a further reduction in the third class fares. Third class fares had been from 2 pies to 2½ pies for many years. Then in the year 1917 they were first increased. Then they were again increased I think about the year 1920 or 1921. This year we have a large amount of surplus and unfortunately instead of using that surplus for reducing third class fares adequately we are using that surplus for reducing freights and first and second class fares and handing over a large sum of money to the general Treasury. I think we are not quite fair to the third class passengers in this respect. The fares have been raised by about 100 per cent. in many cases.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I give the Honourable Members the exact figures? As regards the third class passengers the average rate in 1913-14 was 2·29 pies per mile and in 1923-24 it was 3·53 pies per mile, that is an increase of 54 per cent.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: You are giving me the average increase. There are many railways in which the increase has been 100 per cent. Take the South Indian Railway. The fares for ordinary trains was 2 pies and now the fares are 5 pies. The increase on that railway at least has been more than 100 per cent. I do not wish to go into the details of increases on each railway. There has been some small reduction this year but that reduction is very inadequate and moreover that reduction has been given only for long distance journeys. Members of this House know that third

class passengers to a large extent do not travel as long distances as many of us do. Therefore, the advantage of the reduction will not be enjoyed by a large proportion of the third class passengers travelling on railways. When you have a balance in your hands, you first give the advantage of that balance to second class and first class passengers by reducing their fares by a very large proportion and then you go and reduce the freight on coal. It may be said, Sir, that the reduction of freight on coal will not ultimately result in loss and there may be some more traffic. But if you reduce the third class fares gradually I am quite sure you will not make a loss. You may make a loss for the first year but when you stop the habit of travelling even of the third class passengers, you certainly will to some extent get a smaller revenue; but I feel sure that the policy of the Railway Board in the past has made it quite clear to them that if they keep the fares low the revenue goes on increasing. Therefore, ultimately the revenues of India will not suffer even if you reduce the fares. Sir, in the case of third class passengers the reduction of fares is of great advantage to them. In the case of second and first class, if the fares are high, they may sometimes not travel because many times they travel for the sake of comfort and luxury, not always for the sake of absolute necessity; but in the case of third class passengers they have generally to travel for absolute necessity and therefore when you have some amount to be spent for the reduction of fares the first people who should get advantage of that reduction should be the third class passengers. (An Honourable Member: "Why not boycott the railways?") Unfortunately the third class passengers are human beings and they have to travel. If a boycott of the railways had been possible, they would have tried that method. I do not wish to go into this kind of detail because I know the House has had discussion of this question many times. Moreover, I know that there are Members of this House who have studied the subject much better than I have. My friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar, I am quite sure, will deal with the figures referred to in this connection. I hope, Sir, that the House will accept my motion.

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar (Madura and Ramanad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadian Rural): I will try to be as brief as possible and to the point. The Reserve Fund we expect to spare before next year comes to 12 crores. So the least that you can spend for this may be taken to be between 2 and 2½ crores. Actually it is possible to show that if the old increase of passengers is restored by reducing fares they could make up more than one crore. Practically there will not be much difficulty if you only decide on a 2 crore reduction from the Reserve Fund alone. Of course it may be argued that it will eat away the Reserve Fund but 2 crores out of 12 is nothing, and that will be made up in the course of one or two years.

The next point I wish to place before the House is this. The House must certainly be thankful to the Honourable Mr. Sim and the Director of Finance who have had a lot of trouble to take with it. They have placed before us information which we can use to the fullest extent. For each railway you have got tables framed showing what is the average load for third class passengers, the previous rate charged and the present rate and the consequences of reduction so far, which has been recommended by the Finance Committee. In connection with this matter one word has to be said. I have been speaking to the Honourable Mr. Sim to give relief to all third class passengers. I was particular that the poorer third class

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

passenger should be benefited, but somehow the Railway Finance Committee came to the decision that this was a satisfactory start. But the real third class passenger has really not benefited at all. Below 150 miles he is not to be given any help. It means that most of the third class passengers who travel only 60 miles on an average at the most get no benefit. It was thought apparently that the first class rate being brought down from 24 pies to 18 and the second class rate from 12 pies to 9 pies was a satisfactory start. Certainly it is no start at all. That must be brushed aside and the Department itself says that the second and first class fares were reduced not with a view to allow a loss of income but with a view to increased income because they find that in the last few years they had lost revenue and therefore they have reduced it merely as a business proposition. So any loss that may be anticipated from first and second class ought not to be treated as loss at all for the purposes of our present calculations. It will be made up by the extra revenue that will be got. So we must leave that out of consideration. In their opening speech the Honourable the Commerce Member and Sir Clement Hindley have referred to this fact and they say that the total amount of loss that we will have to be prepared for will be, including the Burma Railways, not less than 123 lakhs. However, we may take it that in the case of the first and second and intermediate class it comes to about 40 lakhs and in the case of the third class the real loss to be calculated for our purposes will be from 70 to 80 lakhs. This amount is also included in a later statement that has been supplied to this House on the 8th February in answer to a question I asked. That appears in the Assembly Debates of the 8th February on page 874, in answer to question No. 129. That gives the answer that if a uniform rate of 3 pies be adopted for all third class passengers the loss to be anticipated will be $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores, and a table is given showing what it will be in each railway and the total is also made up there. If on the other hand a uniform rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ pies per mile be adopted for all railways the loss to be anticipated will be $8\frac{1}{2}$ crores. It might be argued that if these reductions are made the increase in passengers may make up about 1 crore in one case and about 2 crores in the other. The loss will be about $3\frac{1}{2}$ crores in the case of the 3 pies rate and about 6 crores in the case of the $2\frac{1}{2}$ pies rate. As I began this, Sir, I am prepared to contend that just at first we should start only with a loss of about 2 crores. That is not much more than what Sir Charles Innes has already calculated inclusive of the Reserves. He has told us that 123 lakhs is expected to be the reduction, inclusive of the Burma Railways, and we had about 40 lakhs balance on hand which may be utilized towards the further reduction; so that he has made provision for about 160 to 165 lakhs, and the actual amount therefore that is further required will be only about 35 to 40 lakhs. Taking into consideration the increase of income that will result from this reduction and devoting it for the purposes of this reduction* we shall be able to give effect to this 3 pies rate in all paying lines; that is the position that I take. Then I have analysed for all the railways all the suggestions that might be made and I want the Assembly to accept one principle. Where certain railways are now working at a loss we should not make any reduction on those railways, and in fact I find that practically no reduction is proposed, but if there is a reduction already proposed by the Department I do not wish that we should change it. It may have been adopted merely to stimulate more traffic in that area and we may

leave it as it is. Such lines then that will not be immediately asked to lessen the rates are the Bengal Nagpur Railway, the Eastern Bengal Railway and the Assam Bengal Railway. In these cases, if the Assembly agrees with me, I submit that the present rates may stand till both the Department and the railways work them in such a way that there will be lower working expenses and greater revenue, and until larger profits enable us to start reductions, except where as a business proposition it is considered that a reduction in the third class rates is necessary.

When we go into the details of the real effect of what I propose it comes to this, in the case of the North Western Railway the proposal is that up to 300 miles it is to be $3\frac{1}{2}$ pies per mile and beyond 300 miles it is to be 3 pies. What I propose. Sir, is that it should be a uniform rate of 3 pies. Up to 1913-14, the rate was only 2 to $2\frac{1}{2}$ pies on that Railway. At a uniform rate of 3 pies the cost, according to the information given in the answer of the 8th February, on the North Western Railway will be 69 lakhs, of which 30 lakhs is already expected according to the table given in the Railway Finance Committee report of the 18th, 19th and 20th January. So that you will have to add to that only 39 lakhs for that particular Railway. The North Western Railway is one of the biggest systems you have. We next come to the East Indian Railway. The East Indian Railway now includes the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway; the income of both together is about 20 crores. Till last year or the year before the North Western Railway was the biggest earning railway amongst Indian railways, but because of the amalgamation the East Indian Railway becomes the most important and the income from it is some 20 odd crores. Now we find that the reduction proposed by the Department on that line is that the rate be $3\frac{1}{2}$ pies per mile for the first 300 miles and $2\frac{1}{2}$ pies for additional distances. I have forgotten to mention one position that I propose to take in this matter and I request the Assembly to agree with me, and it is that in the case of charges by mail train we ought not to make any reduction at this stage, because passengers travelling by mail trains are mostly the servants of first and second class passengers, or they are persons travelling long distances and mostly of either the upper or middle classes. They are not of the poorer classes. (*Several Honourable Members*: "They are.") Granting that they are, I submit that the Assembly can agree that there may be no reduction. (*Honourable Members*: "No, no.") If, on the other hand reduction is also to be made there, I have worked the figures out so that reduction may be made in their case too to 3 pies. But in the case of mail trains at least I request the Department's proposal may be given effect to just now, because there is a difference between the mail train rates and the ordinary passenger rate. It is the ordinary passengers that may not be taxed more than 3 pies. And in the case of the East Indian Railway the rate proposed of $3\frac{1}{2}$ pies per mile for the first 300 miles and $2\frac{1}{2}$ pies for additional distances does not really give any relief, because most of the journeys performed are less than 300 miles the average lead being 60 miles. The sacrifice of revenue proposed to be made on the East Indian Railway system amounts to about 18½ lakhs. That is for the long distance passengers and also the mail train passengers. What therefore I submit is that the $2\frac{1}{2}$ pies beyond 300 miles may be made into 3 pies and a uniform rate of 3 pies be adopted for all travelling by that railway. The total cost of the reduction to 3 pies is 57 lakhs as shown in the answer, dated 8th February. Of this 57 lakhs you have already announced an expected reduction of revenue of

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

18½ lakhs. Therefore practically you will be adding 39 lakhs by my proposal, and that is on the figures based on a rate of 2½ pies per mile above 300 miles, while I would change that to 3 pies per mile and alter all the difference may not amount to more than about 35 lakhs. Coming now to the South Indian Railway, we find that it is one of the railways which is not prepared to reduce decently at all. The rate went up to 3½ pies per mile and they say that they want to reduce it by ¼ pie per mile for long distances, and not for ordinary passengers. It is a most tragic case and the Agent should have seen that that kind of help is absolutely worthless, and the actual reduction proposed is 17 lakhs. If the present idea is adopted, it will come to 63 lakhs, and if you deduct 17 therefrom, it will be only 46 lakhs. This 46 lakhs is an amount which must be cut out, Sir, from that railway's income; and I do not propose to take the others because there are only two or three lines. The Great Indian Peninsula Railway is another railway which earns about 16 crores, and it is only proper to take note of it, and I find that that is the railway which is least prepared to reduce the rates . . .

Mr. G. G. Sim (Financial Commissioner, Railways): The Great Indian Peninsula Railway? It has the largest reduction.

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar: Not in the third class. It makes the largest reduction in some fares, while the other lines are prepared to do it all round. The present rates were raised to 5 pies per mile for all distances by mail trains and 4 pies per mile for all distances by ordinary trains. They were then changed in October 1922 to 5 pies per mile for the first 300 miles and 4½ pies for additional distances by mail trains, and 4 pies for the first 300 miles and 3½ pies for additional distances by ordinary trains, and these were adopted in 1922. It is proposed to reduce fares by ordinary trains to 4 pies per mile for the first 150 miles and 3½ pies for 151 to 300 miles and 3 pies for additional distances. For the ordinary train no other railway charges four pie on the first stage. And after all the average distance travelled is not more than 60 miles. What is the reduction? You call it reduction? It certainly is reduction for the first and second class, but you cannot call it a reduction for the third class, and you do not benefit a single man of the poorer classes. You cannot pretend that anything has been done by the railway for third class passengers . . .

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member should now conclude his remarks.

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar: The effect of it is, as I say, if you take off the lines which are losing concerns, the 4½ crores that is referred to as being the loss by an average 3 pies rate being taken for all railways will be quite different, as I have calculated; and the result is you get 311.40, that is 311 lakhs will be the loss to be calculated without taking note of the alterations I have suggested. But the alterations I have suggested for the East Indian and the Great Indian Peninsula Railways, adopting the 3 pies rate, will reduce it by another 40 to 50 lakhs in all the lines. That will give you about 2½ crores. Of this, you must remember that while it was 10 million passengers per annum which was the increase previously, it is now only 2 million passengers. The rate of increase has been considerably less. When you make this reduction, it is bound to be at least 7 to 8 million passengers more, and that will give 65 to 70 lakhs. If you do not

get 7 or 8 millions, even if it is less, it can bring it to a loss of only about 2 crores. Even if it is a little bit more or less it does not matter. And if you are not doing it this year, the complaint will rightly be made that sitting in the heights here and sometimes of Simla you are forgetting the poor man in the street. Of course everyone wants convenience as much as possible, but we do not pay attention to the needs of the third class passengers, and I submit therefore that the reduction must be made.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till a Quarter to Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter to Three of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

Dr. K. G. Lchokare (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, in the budget speech on the first day the Honourable Member in charge referred to railway rates being the cheapest in India.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I quoted from the Acworth Committee's Report.

Dr. K. G. Lchokare: Yes, and I find the Honourable Member still sticking to that argument. I should like to examine that argument, Sir. Cheapness or dearness is a relative term. We must take into account the income of an individual while considering the cheapness or the dearness of a railway ticket. A rupee may be very little for a rich man but for a poor man it is too much. Similarly the rate of 8 pies to 12 pies is too high for us in India, while to Englishmen it may be too cheap in England. The daily average income of an Indian labourer is not more than 8 annas at the most, while in England and in other European countries it ranges between Rs. 4 and Rs. 6. That means with one day's income in other civilised countries an ordinary labourer can travel more than 60 miles, while in India at the rate of 4 pies per mile, for the third class, the Indian labourer cannot travel more than 30 miles on one day's wages. Comparing these two points I should like the Honourable Member to see whether the railway fares are the cheapest in India. Secondly, Sir, the cost of construction of these railways on account of the low cost of labour and other things is decidedly lower in India than in other countries. The amount of capital invested being comparatively less per mile it requires less return in India than in other countries. What we are therefore much more concerned with is the ratio of working expenses to the gross return or the gross earnings from the railways. The working expenses are given in the annual report as 4.24 per train mile and the gross earnings per train mile are 7.01. The total working expenses are about 70 crores, while the total gross earnings are 115 crores; that means that the working expenses are about 60 per cent. of the gross earnings. A similar ratio and a still lower one holds in other countries. It is therefore questionable whether the passenger rates in India are the cheapest. Another argument is being advanced in favour of high third class fares. It was advanced last year and it is being advanced this year also, that the Railway authorities decide the railway rates on the principle of what the traffic will bear, that is the principle advocated. I have here

[Dr. K. G. Lohokare.]

with me a book from which I will read out quotations—it is Kiple's "Railroads, Rates and Regulations":

"Two general theories governing the rates chargeable by railways are entertained, known respectively as cost of service and value of service."

Now, the second principle of value of service, *i.e.*, "what the traffic will bear" is usually advocated by the railway authorities in India.

"This argument maintains that, while theoretically cost of service should determine minimum rates,"

—the following words need particular attention—

"owing to the nature of commercial competition, as a matter of fact rates must be based upon the principle of charging what the traffic will bear."

But the proviso here is

"owing to the nature of commercial competition."

Is there commercial competition in the railway rates in India? That is the question. In India railway rates are based much more on the basis of monopoly than on the principle of competition. Had they been based on the principle of competition, this principle of "what the traffic will bear" would have held good. But since there is no competition, since there is monopoly only, this principle does not hold good. Further, Sir, we shall see in this book what is said regarding this principle:

"Cost of service, while unsound as a sole reliance, nevertheless affords an important check upon the value of service principle. Without it there is always grave danger that traffic managers, seeking to enlarge their revenues, may push rates unreasonably high."

That is exactly the notion that my Honourable friend opposite puts forth when he says "I adhere to the principle of what the traffic will bear." I offer him another quotation:

"It is impossible to trace any safeguard against extortion in the operations of a value of service law under such circumstances."

"It is impossible to trace any safeguard against extortion"—that is the result of the principle that is being advocated for the railway fares here. The argument every time put forth is "that on account of putting up third class passenger rates the number of passengers has not declined; therefore traffic bears the fares and therefore we are justified." Yes, Sir, because you have the monopoly in your hands, because you have the whole railway system in your hands you are justified in extorting. It is nothing less than Shylock's ways, Sir! We shall see what the results of this principle have been so long. The average passenger travelling mileage in 1890 was 40.6 miles, in 1900 it came down to 38, in 1916 it came down to 36 and in 1921-22 it came down to 35.67. It is somewhere at that point yet in the case of other railways but the average is declining. Sir, it means that there is still more room for the reduction of rates and thus for an increase in the railway traffic, so that the railways as a commercial concern might be able to earn more than what they have been earning now. Lastly, Sir, take the case of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. In this case the maximum average load is about 40 miles per passenger. I had last time said in this House that the law of decreasing returns has already begun to work in the case of the number of passengers on the Great Indian

Peninsula Railway to which it seems no attention has yet been paid. The intermediate class fares as well as the third class fares are practically where they were. The mail train fares are where they were. The only reduction that has been given is in the case of distances above 300 miles. I shall presently show that the reduction given is not in the interests of the management themselves. We have on our side of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway main roads leading to places 150 miles distant. Now that the Railway Company has been putting up its fares to 4 pies per mile, the motor omnibus service is competing with the Great Indian Peninsula Railway between Poona and Ahmednagar, a distance of about 80 miles. The railway third class fare is Rs. 2/2 whereas the motor company charges only Rs. 2 from a point near the bazar in Poona to the bazar of Ahmednagar. The motor service also takes less time than the railway does. That, Sir, is the result of your putting up fares to 4 pies per mile. Similarly, the traffic is being captured by the motor service between Poona and Satara and Poona and Nasik.

Sir Clement Hindley: Does that mean a railway monopoly?

Dr. K. G. Lohokare: The motor service has now entered into competition with you in a few places and it is scarcely a competition, but it serves to open your eyes that you are putting the railway administration to a loss. Moreover, motor traffic is not meant for covering long distances. It is meant for ordinary cross country roads where there are no railways; but by your policy you have been destroying your own income and putting the State to a loss. That is the point that I want to bring to your notice.

Sir Clement Hindley: Is not that a healthy competition?

Dr. K. G. Lohokare: Scarcely any! But we have to think more of public money than of private money. Now, Sir, looking at the figures that have so very kindly been supplied by the Department in the Finance Committee's Report, we shall compare the increase in the number of passengers on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway and the East Indian Railway. Taking the year 1920-21 as the standard year, the increase in third class passengers on the East Indian Railway is by 45,00 thousands whereas the increase in the case of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway is scarcely 9,00 thousands. I have taken the year 1920-21 because the difference in fares is marked and the number of passengers on both the lines was more or less the same in that year. The above figures, however, go to show that the increase in the case of the East Indian Railway is much greater than the increase on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. It is evident therefore, Sir, that the traffic which could have been obtained by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway has been lost on account of this policy—of 'what the traffic will bear'—of putting up the third and intermediate class fares and extorting as much as possible out of the pockets of the poor people. With those words, Sir, I request that the Government Department will pay attention to this matter seriously and decide on reducing the Great Indian Peninsula Railway intermediate and third class fares.

Mr. Narain Dass (Agra Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it is after all a protest that we have to make. We know that these protests can result in nothing. I am not discussing politics but even in matters financial we know that the final decree, the final order, will rest with the Government. But after having come here, we have to make a protest

[Mr. Narain Dass.]

and we do it. Of this Railway Budget, leaving aside all academic debates, all higher class of talk, I think the crux of the whole Budget, the pivot, the keystone of the whole thing from the point of view of the Indian people is the third class fares. If we go on continuing at a certain standard, the result will be that the money that you will have in your treasury will be tainted money. Sir, I find the following statement in the speech of the Honourable Sir Clement Hindley comparing the financial position of the Railways in the year 1921-22 down to the close of the current financial year:

"The net additions to capital at charge will be approximately 68 crores, general revenues will have received no less than 19 crores 73 lakhs as clear contributions after paying all interest, the railways will have built up a reserve fund of 9.83 crores and have further established a depreciation fund which after meeting all necessary appropriations for replacements and renewals is expected to show a balance of 6 crores 71 lakhs."

Out of this financial muddle, as I should call it, what relief after all has the poor third class passenger got? When he thinks of these piles of reserves, the making up of huge reserve funds, the third class passenger may well cry and come to the door of the Honourable the Commerce Member and ask: "What relief after all have you given me"? When we look, Sir, at the financial estimates for the next year, we find that the upper class passengers are expected to yield, roughly speaking, 4.42 crores, whereas the third class passengers yield to the coffers of the State roughly 32.38 crores. So after all it is the third class passengers, the men who resort to the lowest class of travelling, it is they who fill up the coffers of the railways, and what relief after all do they get? These calculations showing reduction in revenue are mere financial bogeys. Just as in the military domain the Russian and Afghan bogeys were trotted out to keep military expenditure at a certain level, so I say that once Government come to determine that certain taxation should be kept up, they trot out so many bogeys; and the best proof of the fact that they are mere visions, mere dreams, mere bogeys can be established when you come to consider next year the actual receipts and compare them with the estimates that have been put up this time. We will then realise that they are mere bogeys.

Sir, they say that the railways are national property. What is a national property? If in a year of prosperity, not a casual prosperity but a prosperity extending over three or four years, they cannot take over the burden of third class passengers, even by any appreciable amount, what is all this national property and all this talk about prosperity? This at any rate plays no part in our national life beyond fleecing us. If it is national property, all that it means is that it is a close preserve for certain people to draw high salaries, whereas national property must be managed on national lines, and I do not think that anything at all has been done to stamp it with the character of a national business.

Sir, I would not have spoken on this motion at all if it had not been for the fact that Mr. Rama Aiyangar, the master of figures and statistics, has put up certain proposals which can very easily be acted upon by the railway authorities if they have any regard at all for the poor third class passengers. Sir, after all, what he proposes is quite a cautious measure. From 4 pies he does not come down to 2 pies but as a sober politician he proposes merely 3 pies per mile. That proposal reserves an

increment of 50 per cent. over the old rates. If the Railways cannot work with an increase of 50 per cent. guaranteed to them I do not think they can give a good account of themselves.

Sir, with these words I support the motion of Mr. Joshi.

U. Tok Kyi (Burma: Non-European): Sir, I beg to support the motion now before the House. In doing so I should like to bring to the notice of the Honourable the Railway Member the apathy and indifference with which Burma has been treated in the matter of reduction of passenger fares. Sir, the other day the Honourable Member from Sind said that Sind was the Cinderella of India. I cannot agree with him. Burma has always been the Cinderella of India and she is still the Cinderella of India. She has always been left out in the cold and the solitary voice of her representative in this House has no effect and is a mere cry in the wilderness. Sir, the question of reduction of third class passenger fares was taken up in this House this time last year and action has been taken by most of the Railways except the Burma Railways and one or two others. In some Railways reduction of fares has been made not only for the third class passengers but for the first and second class as well, but in Burma the railway authorities do not think fit to start reductions as yet. The Honourable Mover of the motion says that he wants further to reduce the fares for the third class passengers. As for me, Sir, I need not ask this for Burma. I simply ask to have the fares reduced for the first time. I do not want to have further reductions made; I simply want to start reduction now. I know that there is a budget provision for 128 lakhs of rupees to cover the loss consequent on reduction in passenger fares. I also know that there is provided 40 lakhs more to cover further loss that may be incurred by railways which want to follow suit in reduction of fares and by railways which want still further to reduce their fares. I therefore think, Sir, that there should be no difficulty whatever for the Burma Railways to reduce their passenger fares as other Railways have done. And it is expected that there will be a profit of about 105 lakhs of rupees from Burma Railways in the coming year and this profit is only a little less than the profit expected from the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. Certainly, Sir, out of this huge profit the Burma Railways can easily and readily make the reduction of fares if they wish it.

Sir, my object in supporting the motion is to ask the Honourable Railway Member to impress the importance of the matter on the Burma Railway Administration and to speed it up.

Rai Sahib M. Harbilas Sarda (Ajmer-Merwara: General): Sir, the policy of the Government of India from the earliest times was to foster and develop passenger traffic by a low tariff of fares on railways. This policy was supported by eminent railway experts like Sir Guilford Molesworth, the late Colonel J. G. Medley, Mr. Horace Bell, Sir Thomas Robertson and others.

By the low tariff the third class passenger traffic was steadily developed by killing the traffic formerly carried by *ekkas* and carts alongside the railroads. The third class passengers traffic yielded substantial profits to the railways, while the first and second classes were running at a loss and

[Rai Sahib M. Harbilas Sarda.]

have always run at a loss. This is abundantly clear from the recorded statistics which the Railway Board used to publish and the publication of which, as Mr. Joshi said yesterday, has been discontinued.

After 36 years of successful working of the low third class fares, the Railway Board in 1916 authorised the retrograde step of enhancing the passenger fares on the Indian Railways. The first increase was described in the budget debate in 1918 as a war measure, and it was then understood that the enactment would be withdrawn after the war. But the war is over and the old tariff has not been restored. In fact, the Railway Administrations made further enhancements in 1920 and 1921-22, and the enhanced fares were 66 to over 200 per cent. higher than the fares that obtained in 1916. Take for instance, the intermediate class on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway which was 3 pies per mile for the first 800 miles and 2 pies per mile for additional distances. It was raised to $7\frac{1}{2}$ pies per mile for all distances. This rate of $7\frac{1}{2}$ pies applied also on the Great Indian Peninsula and the South Indian Railways. Take the case of the third class on the South Indian Railway. The former tariff was:

	Mail trains.	Ordinary trains.
For first 50 miles	2½ pies	2 pies.
For 51 to 200 miles	2 "	2 "
For additional distances	1 pie	1 pie.

The enhanced fares were 5 pies per mile for mail and $3\frac{3}{4}$ pies for ordinary trains for all distances. The increases were:

Mail trains—100 per cent. and more.

Ordinary trains—87½ to 120 per cent.

The increase in the intermediate and third class fares on the other railways varied considerably. The railway fares on the principal lines for distances up to 800 miles were 30 or 24 pies per mile against 12 or 18 pies before, *for the 1st Class*; 15 or 12 pies per mile against 6, 8 or 9 pies before, *for the 2nd class*; $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 pies per mile against $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 pies before, *for the intermediate class*; 5 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ pies per mile against $2\frac{1}{2}$ to less than 2 pies before, *for the third class*.

The managers of the railways have evidently ignored the lesson of the past history of the Indian Railways. They have repeated the mistakes which were made in the sixties of the last century when high fares similar to the present were charged and had to be reduced in order to attract traffic. In 1868, Lord Mayo recorded a strong protest against the action of the Secretary of State in authorising an enhancement of fares on the Madras Railway Company's line. His Lordship wrote:

"It is blind policy to deal with our native millions in this way, it is to the third class we must look to make our railways pay, and it is not by raising fares but by cheapening the cost of carriage and locomotion, etc., that we must hope to develop the enormous revenue that we are now only touching from this source. The tendency of the railway management in this direction should be checked on every possible occasion."

These words are as true to-day as they were in 1868.

At page 81 of the Railway Administration Report of 1920-21, the Railway Board by making comparison with average receipts per passenger in

other countries tried to show that the passenger fares in India were the cheapest in the world. That comparison of money values alone is misleading and not quite fair without making due allowance for the buying power of money in the different countries or the capacity of the people to pay for the railway journeys. We have to consider the economic condition of the people who make use of these railways before we can judge whether a tariff is low or high. This point was made perfectly clear by Mr. Neville Priestly in his Report of 1903 on the organisation and policy of Railways in America. I cannot do better than quote the passage from the Report:

'The rate of wage in America for unskilled labourers averages 1.25 or 750 pies or Rs. 3-14 6 a day. By the expenditure of one day's wages such a man can travel over 63 miles. By the expenditure of a month's (30 days) wages he could travel 1,894 miles. The rate of wage (not average) in most parts of India for the same class of workers is 2 annas or 24 pies a day. By the expenditure of one day's wages such a man could not travel more than ten miles and his whole month's wages would only carry him three hundred miles. While therefore the fares charged to the lowest class of passengers are actually lower in India than in America, in effect they are much higher.'

Though wages have risen, still the comparison holds good.

Sir Thomas Robertson (Special Railway Commissioner) emphatically wrote in his report of 1903 that the fares in India should broadly speaking be only about one-sixth of those charged in England, before they can be regarded relatively as equal to those in England.

These are the opinions not of ill-informed critics, but of experts, who were specially employed by the Government of India to investigate matters for the better administration of Indian Railways. The Railway Board have ignored the lessons which have cost India heavily. The Railway Board and the present Railway Administrations are responsible for the retrograde policy of charging high fares.

Sir Clement Hindley: May I ask the date of that document which the Honourable Member is reading?

Rai Sahib M. Harbilas Sarda: 1903; the date does not matter, the facts are there and the principle stands.

It is a remarkable fact that only the working companies made large increases in the fares, while the two administrations under the direct control of the State—the North Western Railway and the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway—were satisfied with moderate increases.

The high fares check the growth of passenger traffic and are an unnecessary burden upon the people, and I think Government would be well advised to accept this policy and to direct that low tariff fares should be enforced again.

The Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway in 1916 had a sliding scale of intermediate class fares on their metre gauge system, namely, 3 pies per mile for the first 300 miles and 2 pies per mile for additional distances. The enhanced fares are uniformly 6 pies per mile on the broad gauge and 5 pies per mile over the metre gauge which means an increase of over 66 per cent. on the fares of 1916.

[Rai Sahib M. Harbilas Sarda.]

The increased fares for the intermediate class still remain higher than the fares of 1916 by the following percentages especially in the first distance of charge:

- Over 48 per cent. on the North Western Railway.
- 66 per cent. on the Eastern Bengal Railway.
- 100 per cent. on the East Indian Railway.
- 88 per cent. on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.
- 66 per cent. on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.
- 64 per cent. on the Bengal Nagpur Railway.
- 33 per cent. on the Burma Railways.
- Over 25 per cent. on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

The increases in the third class fares on the South Indian Railway were the largest. In 1916 it had two sliding scales of:

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| 2½ pias for 1 to 50 miles | } by mail trains |
| 2 pias for 51 to 200 miles | |
| 1½ pias for over 200 miles | |

and of

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2 pias for 1 to 200 miles, and | } by ordinary trains. |
| 1½ pias for additional distances | |

These fares were raised to 5 pias by mail and 3½ pias by ordinary trains. It has allowed a reduction of half a pie to one pie in mail fares and of one quarter pie in the ordinary fares. The increases over the 1916 fares still remain at 80 to 166 per cent. for the varying distances. The percentages of such increases over other lines are as follows:

- Over 40 per cent. on the North Western Railway.
- 40 to 100 per cent. on the Eastern Bengal Railway.
- 40 to 150 per cent. on the East Indian Railway.
- 40 to 130 per cent. on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.
- 50 to 100 per cent. on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.
- 50 per cent. on the Bengal Nagpur Railway.
- 44 to 81 per cent. on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.
- 40 per cent. on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.
- 38 per cent. on the Burma Railways.
- 33 to 166 per cent. on the Assam Bengal Railway.

These increases are very heavy and the public who have defrayed all the cost and met all the losses on account of the Railways have a right to demand a reduction. It is not a business matter as the Honourable the Commerce Member put it on the 22nd February, 1926. In these railway matters no commercial man is concerned. The Railways are the property of the people and the people have a right to use them at a cost which is not greater than that incurred on the railways.

Sardar V. N. Mutalik (Gujarat and Deccan Sardars and Inamdars Landholders): I am not fully convinced, Sir, that there is a very very strong case for reduction in third class fares at this stage. After all, Sir, we must take into consideration one thing, that our Railways have to be run on commercial lines and anything which will reduce the income of the Railways will only bring about that next year we shall not be in the same position with regard to railway revenue as we are to-day. I have got this

chart before me which is printed in the Administration Report of the Railways for 1924-25. From the chart it will be seen, Sir, that there is a steady increase in third class traffic. During some years there was a very great increase. Those years, Sir, were years after the war and they may be taken to have been abnormal years when there was this great rise; but even after normal times were reached there has been a steady rise. Looking to any other class of passengers you will not see that there is a steady fall in passenger traffic. If, Sir, we reduce the fares all round now, a loss will have to be faced, and I am afraid the traffic will not increase in the proportion in which we will suffer loss. After all there is a limit to the increase in third class traffic. People will not always travel because fares are reduced.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Are they to be taxed for this reason?

Sardar V. N. Mutalik: I do not want to tax them. I do want the fares to be only just sufficient to take them from one place to another, but on a commercial basis. I think the House will do well to consider this position. It is not merely from the political point of view that this matter should be considered. Sir, I have never gone against the wishes of this side of the House but I do feel that in this case we should take—(*An Honourable Member:* "A Sardar's view") call it a 'Sardars' view' if you want, but I mean only a business view of the whole situation.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Sir, I shall not take more than one minute because my Honourable friend Rai Sahib Harbilas Sarda has gone into the historical aspects of the case very fully and has made out a case which my Honourable friend Sir Clement Hindley will find it difficult to answer.

Sir Clement Hindley said this morning that scandal was a word which did not easily rise to his lips. I would ask him to give me a word to describe that breach of promise. I think "scandal" a very mild word to describe it. I charge the Government to-day with a breach of promise to the Indian public in raising the fares after the war. In reply to the debate which took place in this Council in March 1918 Sir George Barnes on behalf of Government said that the enhancement of fares was made *owing to the war in Europe*. It was understood that the enhancements were temporary and would be withdrawn after the war. Is the war over?

Mr. W. S. J. Willson: No.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: My friend Mr Willson says "No." Is the war in Europe over?

Mr. W. S. J. Willson: The effects of it are not over.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: The effects of the war are not over! Sir Charles Innes also gently whispers to me that the effects are still there. Well, I do hope the Government will take this matter into serious consideration and make a serious effort to reduce the fares of third class passengers, because they are the backbone of the Railways.

***Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Sir, I only wish to make one or two inquiries. In the statement at page 39 of Volume VI of the Standing Finance Committee's Report, an estimate of the probable loss of revenue on account of the proposed reduction is given; and the Railways who have

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

consented to reduce their rates are the Great Indian Peninsula, the South Indian, the Assam-Bengal, the North Western, the Bengal Nagpur and the East Indian Railways. I wish to know, Sir, whether there is any proposal from the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway to reduce the rates on their line, and also whether there are any proposals from other lines for a reduction of rates. It seems to me, Sir, if there is to be a reduction of rates it should be on some system so that everybody who is concerned will have some benefit from that reduction. That is the first point on which I should like to ask the Honourable Member in charge to enlighten me.

Now that various inequalities in rates have been urged in this House I should like to know from the Honourable Member whether this question would be within the purview of the Rates Tribunal or whether the word "rates" is used in any technical sense. Would questions which several passenger associations in the various provinces have with reference to rates and fares be within the cognisance of the Rates Tribunal? It seems to me instead of allowing these grievances to go unredressed the best policy for the Honourable Member would be to refer questions with reference to reduction of fares as early as possible to this Tribunal, or if necessary to get it investigated in any other manner which may appear necessary.

I find here a rough preliminary draft printed as annexure "B" in the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways which gives certain figures as regards percentages of increase in rates as well as increases in prices of various materials. It is stated that the average fare charged per passenger per mile is 52·7 over the rates which prevailed in 1913-14. Similarly prices are shown to have increased by 188 per cent. I should like the Honourable Member to say where he got this information from, and whether this question with reference to the ratio of increase in the prices of various commodities which are printed on that page, has been gone into by the Standing Finance Committee. If it is once admitted that there has been a considerable increase in the prices of the various articles required by the Railways such as iron and steel, coal building material, clothing and so on, quite clearly the working expenses should also go up if not to the extent of the rise in prices at any rate to some extent.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: 106 per cent.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: Therefore I think there is a case for investigation as to what proportion of this increase is justifiable. If the Railway Board fixes these rates arbitrarily, of course it will not give any satisfaction; and therefore I think the best solution of this difficulty is to have a thorough investigation into the ratio of increase and also the proportion of increase which is justifiable on the present condition of things.

Syed Majid Baksh: Sir, I may say some thing about the Burma Railways although I have not seen Burma in my life. My Honourable Burmese friend was making out a case for railways in Burma. I do not for one moment see eye to eye with my friend. There are great difficulties about railways in Burma. For example, in Burma there are great teakwood forests and he must know that forests must be cleared first before railways can be built, and Government are doing that. Good sleepers are also necessary for laying down railways, and until the whole of the teakwood forests is cleared in Burma my friend cannot expect

to have railways there. Then there is another consideration. There is enough oil in Burma, I mean mineral oil, and my friend must remember that sufficient oil must be raised before the railways can move on oiled wheels. There are other considerations. Oil is sometimes necessary to induce people to do certain thing and sufficient consideration must also be given to that fact. It is absolutely necessary for the dry engineering wheels of Sir Clement Hindley or the dry budget figures of the Railway Member. For these considerations I support the Government case.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Between the statistics of the Treasury Bench and the doubts and difficulties of my friend Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao I am sure the third class passengers will suffer always. To-day I am not inclined to blame the Government Benches in any manner but I want to blame the members of the Standing Finance Committee who gave their approval. I do not grudge for one moment the powers of hypnotism which Mr. Sin has developed. Under his hypnotic influence the thunders of this House have become the slumbers there and the sobriety of this House becomes inanity amounting to inebriety in the committee room. Therefore we find a record made that the Committee consider that a satisfactory start had been made in the reduction of passenger fares and they add that:

“the question might be immediately considered as to whether on the other prosperous railways except the Assam Bengal Railway, the Eastern Bengal Railway and the Bengal Nagpur Railway where the financial position is unsatisfactory more substantial reductions in first and second class fares should not be made on the lines of those made on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.”

Sir, yesterday I was saying that there was an extravagant expenditure on the Eastern Bengal Railway, which might be reduced and relief given to third class passengers. It is no good telling us that you have made reductions in all classes because so far as the first class is concerned it is no good to the country at all. Perhaps you have a chimerical idea of the loss you sustain by the reduction but certainly if you calculate the amount of the travelling allowances of first class Government servants and Members of the Legislatures, etc., you really do not suffer any loss at all. The real question is what benefit have you conferred on the third class passengers. If they travel more than 150 miles and in some cases more than 300 miles you will give them some relief. Yesterday, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes asked how many people come from Madras to Delhi direct, and I will ask how many passengers travel more than 150 miles at a stretch. I may classify third class passengers under four heads, those who travel on trade business, court business, social amenities and pilgrimage. In all these cases they never travel more than 300 miles. Most of the Indian traders are not accustomed to travel long distances. They only go to the nearest railway station. As regards court business it is all confined to one district or one province and that is rarely more than 150 or 300 miles. As for marriages and seeing relations and so on, in this case also the relations are all in a close circle. As regards pilgrimage, which pilgrim goes at a stretch more than 300 miles? There are 100 pilgrim centres on the way. At least 50 of these places the pilgrims halt and they never travel more than 300 miles at a stretch. I wonder how you calculate the losses. These figures must be obvious only to you and to Mr. Rama Aiyangar. So far as the third class passengers are concerned, how have you calculated these losses?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: At the end they will come and say that they have made a profit.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: You must collect the information from the various stations as to how many cases there were in which tickets were issued for 150 miles or more. You frame these estimates in your office without calling for information.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I interrupt the Honourable Member for one moment. The estimates we have furnished are based on estimates furnished by the railways themselves.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: When you have given so many statistics as to the average lead you can devote one page to showing how many passengers took tickets for more than 150 or 300 miles. You have not done that. You talk of the average lead as 30, 40, 50 miles and so on. You take two men's income. One man gets 100 and the other man 5 and you say that each of them gets 52-8-0 and so they must both be prosperous. That is your idea of statistics. How can we be carried away by that? The third class passengers generally come from remote villages. They pay cart hire and are subjected to so many difficulties, as they travel with their families and children. As regards the passengers going to pilgrim centres, even if you deduct by half a pie, 2 annas is taken away from them as pilgrim tax. The next question that I want to ask is about a uniform flat rate on all the railways. I see Sir Charles Innes shaking his head. That is because he has got Sir Clement Hindley sitting by his side. It is his tenacity that prevails. Sir, on this subject I will read to you what Lord Inchcape's Committee said, and then close:

"We ascertained that no steps have been taken to give effect to one of the most important recommendations made by the Indian Railway Accounts Committee, viz., that route and rate books should be supplied to each station. It is stated by the Chief Commissioner that 'it is possible that the ideal aimed at by the Committee will be difficult to attain as both rates and routes are subject to local conditions and to changes at frequent intervals'. The difficulties to which reference is made exist also in America and in England and we are informed by the Auditor General that, in his view and in that of the Railway Accounts Committee, it is quite practicable to prepare rate and route books in India and that the introduction of such books would be a source of economy as it would enable the present elaborate system of traffic audit to be radically simplified. Another important recommendation made by the Accounts Committee was that the receipts on through traffic should be divided on the totals of the monthly abstracts, the division between railways being made on a mileage or decimal basis. This practice obtains on British and American railways and we see no reason why it should not be adopted on Indian railways. The Chief Commissioner has stated that the proposal is dependent upon the introduction of a system of uniform rates on all lines but we cannot regard this difficulty as insuperable and it must have been well known to the Accounts Committee before they made their report. It is in our opinion desirable that the recommendations made by the Accounts Committee which have not yet been adopted should have the immediate attention of the Financial Adviser whose appointment has been proposed."

But Sir Clement Hindley is against the introduction of a uniform rate and therefore the Financial Commissioner and the Member for Railways are of the same opinion. On the other hand the Committee said that for account and audit purposes and for purposes of general convenience it is desirable to have one uniform system.

Mr. G. G. Sim: I am surprised to hear from Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar that he has not been supplied with a sufficient amount of statistics. I had gathered from previous speakers that they have had more than

enough. Even Mr. Rama Aiyangar stated that he had enough figures, statistics and statements to batten upon. Mr. Rama Aiyangar's proposal was that, instead of working out what reduction we might have in rates and fares for individual railways separately, we should have a uniform reduction, or uniform rate for all railways. He proposed to exempt from this proposal three particular railways which are not paying their way. Incidentally I might explain to my friend Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar that when I told him the other day of the great improvement on the Eastern Bengal Railway I referred to the net improvement as compared with past years. I did not state that that railway was yet paying what we consider it ought to do in the way of a return on the capital sunk in the line. Now, Sir, the House will recollect that last year was the first year in which we had the separation of the finances, that it is only three years ago since our railways were almost bankrupt, and it is with reference to that fact that the Standing Finance Committee expressed gratification that matters had been so greatly improved that we could already contemplate a reduction in rates and fares. I am perfectly certain that three years ago even Mr. Duraiswami Aiyangar did not consider this within the realm of probabilities. At the same time the House will understand that for the last three years we have been bearing hard on the Agents of different railways to get them to make the lines financially sound. We have been effecting economies and insisting upon each line showing a proper return. It is rather difficult to expect them all at once to come suddenly forward with full proposals for reductions in rates and fares. We were able only this year—although I admit we have taken a very considerable risk to notify the Agents that we were prepared to consider such proposals. We are only in a position to accept any proposals at all owing to the separation of the finances. Honourable Members must be perfectly well aware that a reduction in rates and fares must for the first few years involve a loss in our net revenues; and had we not had separation, had we not started building up reserves, it would not have been possible for many years to adopt that course. Now, Sir, Mr. Rama Aiyangar's general position was this. He said that if you cut down the fares you always get a corresponding increase in millions and millions of passengers and receipts. It made me dizzy to hear him easily reeling off those figures. Reduce your fares, he said, to 8½ pies and you will get 10 millions; and reduce your fares to 8 pies and you will get 50 millions or whatever it was. I wonder that the South Indian Railway did not take him on as their Financial Commissioner. (Laughter.) Even Mr. Chetty must admit that Mr. Rama Aiyangar has qualified himself for work of that nature by his hard work and assiduity for several years past. But it occurred to me, that the hard-headed Directors of the Company might consider that Mr. Rama Aiyangar was working on the principle of the Irishman who said that you can make a profit by selling oranges at less than cost price—if only you sell enough of them. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, that exactly is the principle on which that Honourable Member is working. He stated that he had verified the figures he put up. I do not know how he did so, whether he went to these millions of passengers and asked them the exact distances they were prepared to travel at the different rates. But none of our Agents have been able to work out the matter in exactly that way. Now, Sir, if the Honourable Member admits that you cannot apply a uniform rate to lines which are run at a loss, surely he gives away the whole idea of having a uniform rate at all. There can be no justification whatsoever for a uniform rate for all railways. The cost . . .

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: May I ask the Honourable Member whether he is satisfied that further retrenchment on those lines will not enable them to work so as to permit a uniform rate on all railways?

Mr. G. G. Sim: I am perfectly satisfied that it is quite impossible to work every railway at the same uniform rate in every case. Circumstances are different in every part of the country. Does the Honourable Member mean that you could work the Assam Bengal Railway for the same rates as the South Indian, or work a train up the Ghats section of the Great Indian Peninsula at the same cost as the train that trundles him along past Trichinopoly? The thing is impossible. This question, Sir, was discussed at length before the Standing Finance Committee, and as Honourable Members will observe, only one member of the Committee put forward a proposal for a uniform rate. The other members were not in favour of that proposal.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: At least one other member was not present.

Mr. G. G. Sim: Mr. Neogy, Sir, has been frequently absent from our committee meetings, and that is the reason why I am deprived of his no doubt valuable assistance and the Assembly itself is deprived of very sound advice that I have no doubt Mr. Neogy could have given them if he had come to those meetings and learnt what the actual facts are on which the findings of his colleagues on the Committee were based.

Reference has been made to-day to the question of charging according to what the 'traffic will bear.' Many Honourable Members have suggested that that policy is a policy of looting the public—a policy that the railways adopt because they have a monopoly. One Honourable Member said that the railways were a monopoly only in this country. What on earth he meant I have not the faintest idea, because, so far as I am aware, railways are a monopoly in every country. He then went on to suggest that we ought to regulate our third class fares in this country.

Mr. T. C. Goswami (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): What on earth is the meaning of that, that the railways are a monopoly in every country?

Mr. G. G. Sim: In every country a railway company has a monopoly of railway working in the area given to its charge. No other company can come into its area and construct another line.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: There is the competition, Sir, of lines worked by different companies.

Mr. G. G. Sim: You have the same thing here. We have separate companies in this country and you have the same kind of competition.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Tirhut Division: Non-Muhammadan): What is the competition with the Bengal and North Western Railway?

Mr. G. G. Sim: The Honourable Member who made that particular statement then went on to state that in his own particular neighbourhood competition had started in the form of motor buses and that they diverted a considerable amount of traffic. Now, Sir, what does this question of fixing the fares according to what the traffic will bear mean? All that it means is this. In fixing fares you have got two limits. You have a minimum limit as you cannot charge for your fares a smaller sum than will be sufficient to meet the additional expenditure involved in carrying the traffic; and the maximum limit is that you must not charge fares higher than the traffic will bear; that is to say, you must not charge fares which will have the result of diverting traffic from your line.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Is that the meaning? Have you read Acworth's book and do you agree with the view expressed therein?

Mr. G. G. Sim: Yes. About this question of a uniform rate, I say that not only can you not have a uniform rate for all railways, but you cannot have a uniform rate for all distances upon the same railway. The Honourable Member who put forward the proposal for a uniform rate meant, I understand, that you must have a flat rate per mile irrespective of distance travelled; but I say that is not an economical method of fixing the rates. It has always been customary on railways to have a telescopic rate, a rate fixed according to the distance travelled; and the reason is perfectly obvious. It costs a railway very much less to carry one person for 200 miles than to carry 10 persons 20 miles. If you look at it from the point of view of the railway, you must take into account the cost of working. At the same time you can look at it from the point of view of the passenger. If you want to attract traffic to your railways you have undoubtedly got to take into account the rates which people will be prepared to pay for particular journeys. I do not wish to go so far as one Honourable Member who suggested that our third class fares should bear the same relation to the pay of a workman in India as the third class fare bears to the pay of a workman in England. You might as well ask our friends from Bombay to adopt the same principle in determining the price of their piece-goods. But certainly this fact has to be borne in mind that the longer a journey is, the heavier the burden is upon the passenger. If a person is having a week's holiday and goes a distance of 20 miles to spend it, the amount he pays in fares is a very much smaller proportion of his total expenditure than the fare would be if he travels say 500 miles—and that is at the root of the whole of this principle of telescopic rates from the passenger's point of view. As regards passengers who frequently travel for short distances, they are already provided for by the issue of season and monthly tickets.

One or two objections that have been made have I think considerable force regarding the action we have so far taken. I have already explained to the House that this action was taken rather in a hurry and does not represent the final decision as to what is possible with the amount of money available. The main objection taken was this, that the concession is only being given to people who travel more than 300 miles. That statement is not quite correct as you will find that some railways are giving concessions to passengers travelling more than 50 miles, some to passengers travelling more than 150 miles and some to passengers travelling over 300 miles. If you refer to the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee, you will find that this is the objection which that Committee took. They pointed out that 300 miles was far too long a distance to be applied as the limit for short distance travelling, and they suggested that each Agent should be asked to work out revised proposals for third class passenger traffic by working out rates for shorter zones. The Government have accepted the proposals of the Committee and sent their recommendations to the Agents of the various railways, and we are already receiving a certain number of proposals in that direction. I should like to explain to the House that when the Honourable the Commerce Member stated that we allowed in the Budget for another 40 lakhs for further reduction in fares, he did not mean that that 40 lakhs represented the loss to be incurred in a period of 12 months. As Honourable Members are probably aware, it takes a very long time to make the necessary arrangements for introducing a reduction in rates and fares. We have to reprint the tickets and to reprint all the

[Mr. G. G. Sinn.]

tariff books, and this 40 lakhs will be available for reductions that will be in force in some cases for six months and in some cases for three months only. But we have addressed the Agents of all railways and pointed out that we consider that the financial position is sufficiently sound to allow us to entertain proposals which might have the effect of reducing our net revenue.

A few minutes ago there was a little dispute between two Honourable Members regarding Burma. One Honourable Member stated that he proposes to vote for the motion because Burma had not got any reductions and the other Honourable Member stated that Burma should not get any reductions. I must disappoint both of them; but the fact is that neither of them appears to have listened to the speech of the Honourable the Commerce Member. The Honourable the Commerce Member stated that the Burma Railways had decided to reduce third class fares from 4 to 3½ pies for the first 300 miles and 3½ to 3 pies for distances beyond 300 miles, and that the effect of the total reductions will be a loss of Rs. 12 lakhs net. We have just received information that the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway are also reducing their fares for journeys of more than 150 miles, and we expect to get similar proposals from other railways in the course of the year. I hope therefore that Honourable Members will realize that we have gone as far as we can, and that we will make such further reductions as will ultimately prove remunerative.

Mr. President: The question is :

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses : Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The Assembly divided :

AYES—56.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Khan
Bahadur.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Chaman Lall, Mr.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Deshmukh, Mr. R. M.
Duni Chand, Lala.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
Ghose, Mr. S. C.
Ghulam Abbas, Sayyad.
Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Husainally, Khan Bahadur W. M.
Ismail Khan, Mr.
Jeyangar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hosain.
Laipat Rai, Lala.
Lohokare Dr. K. G.
Mahmood Schammad Sahib Bahadur,
Mr.

Majid Baksh, Syed.
Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
Sayad.
Narain Dass, Mr.
Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
Piyare Lal, Lala.
Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
Sarda, Raj Sahib M. Harbilas.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
Bahadur.
Shafiee, Maulvi Mohammad.
Singh, Mr. Gava Prasad.
Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Talatuley, Mr. S. D.
Tok Kvi, U.
Venkateswaraiah, Mr. B.
Vishindas, Mr. Harchandral.
Yakub, Maulvi Mohammad.
Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—41.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.	Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.	Macphail, The Rev. Dr. E. M.
Ayer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.	Makan, Khan Sahib M. E.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.	Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
Bajpai, Mr. R. S.	Muddiman, The Honourable Sir Alexander.
Bhore, Mr. J. W.	Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.	Naidu, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Bray, Sir Denys.	Neave, Mr. E. R.
Calvert, Mr. H.	Owens, Lieut.-Col. F. C.
Cocke, Mr. H. G.	Rahman, Khan Bahadur A.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.	Roffey, Mr. E. S.
Donovan, Mr. J. T.	Sim, Mr. G. G.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J.	Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Gordon, Mr. R. G.	Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
Graham, Mr. L.	Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Hayman, Mr. A. M.	Tonkinson, Mr. H.
Hezlett, Mr. J.	Vernon, Mr. H. A. B.
Hindley, Sir Clement.	Vijayaraghavacharyar, Sir Tiruvalangadi.
Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur Captain.	Young, Mr. G. M.
Hudson, Mr. W. F.	
Ince, The Honourable Sir Charles.	
Jatar, Mr. K. S.	

The motion was adopted.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

HUNGER STRIKE BY THE BENGAL STATE PRISONERS IN THE MANDALAY JAIL.

Mr. T. C. Goswami (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Mr. President, you were good enough to admit the motion which I am about to move this afternoon; and the House was kind enough to permit that the motion should be made at 4 O'Clock this afternoon. The motion that I have to move is, under the Rules in this form, namely:

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

Sir, I want this adjournment for the purpose of discussing an urgent matter of public importance, namely, the hunger strike to which the Bengal State prisoners in Mandalay jail have resorted. Sir, I wish to bring to the notice of this House that the State prisoners in Mandalay jail have always suffered great hardships and have been subjected to inhuman treatment. Questions have been asked in this Assembly, questions have been asked in the Bengal Legislative Council, asking for information on specific cases of ill-treatment that were brought to the notice of the Government by those questions. The replies have invariably been evasive, except, when on rare occasions the Home Member, either here or in Bengal, took upon himself the responsibility of saying that he was satisfied that the treatment of the State prisoners in Mandalay jail was all that could be desired. Sir, resort to hunger-strike is a very serious step, endangering the lives of the detenus. We have known instances of people having had the strength of will to continue their hunger-strike unto death; and those who know Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, who is one of the detenus who have resorted to hunger-strike, those who know the high character of Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, can realise that his life is in peril. Perhaps the end of his life may be a prospect of great satisfaction to the Home Member and the Government of India; but I think I am voicing the sentiment not merely

[Mr. T. C. Goswami.]

of Bengal but of the whole of India when I say that India has in recent years produced very few young men of the high character of Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose. (Applause.) Whatever may be said by those whose testimony I am not prepared to believe, whatever perjured statements may have been made regarding his complicity in revolutionary crime, I claim it as a privilege that I have been his friend and admirer. Sir, this hunger-strike is not the direct result of the withholding from him and his friends by Government of legitimate facilities for worship according to their own religion in Mandalay jail; it is the result of an accumulation of grievances in that jail. Life there, we have every reason to believe, has been made intolerable for the State prisoners. (Looking at the clock) Sir, this is a race with time for me, and as I have got a few things to say I shall have to hurry on. It has been brought to our knowledge that they have not only been insulted frequently, they were often denied ordinary comforts. Once Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose—and we know it for a fact; and if Government can rely on their information, I think we can with equal confidence rely on our information—Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, Chief Executive Officer of the largest Municipal Corporation in Asia, was provided with convict blankets, which he spurned with contempt. Now, when we say—and we do not say without information—that these political prisoners are ill-treated, and then responsible representatives of Government get up and say that they have made thorough inquiries and are satisfied that they are not actually ill-treated, the position becomes very difficult. It is possible that some Honourable Members of this House whose last vestige of faith in the present administration is still lingering, believe the statements when they are so solemnly made. Sir, this morning there has been a revelation in Delhi, and I submit that what I am going to bring to the notice of this House is entirely relevant to the debate in question. Till the morning of the 23rd February, 1926, the interesting contents of the second and the third volume of the Indian Jails Committee Report, 1919-20, were carefully concealed from the public. So late as yesterday I wrote to the Secretary in the Home Department asking that I may be supplied with a copy of the second volume of the Jail Committee's Report, and I was answered in these terms: "The second volume has not been published." I need not tell the House whether that reply puzzled me or amused me. My answer to that is what has appeared in the *Forward* which was received in Delhi this morning. Naturally I feel great responsibility for whatever is published in the *Forward*. The evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel Mulvany, who says that he had perhaps "more to do with the imprisonment of political prisoners than any jail officer in India", is at last given out; and I asked the Secretary of the Home Department again whether in view of this disclosure, he would not now make available to me the official copy, which, though not published, I knew was printed. I tell the Honourable the Home Member frankly, Sir, that I would not have raised this question unless I had an opportunity of comparing what has appeared in a newspaper with the actual official copy, which, I thankfully acknowledge, was supplied to me by the courtesy of the Home Member this morning. I compared them, and I think my friend the Honourable the Home Member is satisfied that the quotations given in the *Forward*, Town edition, dated the 23rd February, 1926, are accurate. There you have the testimony of a man who had more to do with the imprisonment of political prisoners than any jail officer in India at the time; and it is very material

in substantiating our position, that we have not the slightest reason to put any credence in the ready and confident statements that are made by Home Members in various places regarding the good treatment of political prisoners. I will take the liberty of reading somewhat long extracts, for I want them to be on the record of the Legislative Assembly so that our official Reports, which travel across the seas, may also inform the world what a wretched Government we are under. This is what Colonel Mulvany says:

"It is equally known that Government have invariably been able to prove from official statements and reports that these complaints were groundless. And yet in my experience there was every reason for complaint."

Here are his credentials:

"I have been, *he says*, in charge of one or the other of the Calcutta Jails since the very beginning of the anarchical movement and I have had perhaps more to do with the imprisonment of political prisoners than any jail officer in India. And I say deliberately and with full consciousness of the serious nature of my statement that not only was the confinement to which these men were subjected positively inhuman, but that, in fact misleading reports were deliberately submitted to the Government."

(*Cries of "shame."*)

This was an officer of the Government who had a conscience.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): An Irishman.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: He proceeds, unable to persuade the anguish of his soul into a recognition of expediency:

"I feel very strongly on this point and I write under the greatest restraint, for I consider that the share I was compelled to accept in this painful business was and is a disgrace which can never be obliterated. And I cannot say less than that my feelings were outraged by the cruelty of the treatment I was ordered and expected to carry out."

Then, further on, he says that in certain reports he had actually expressed his opinion—to quote his own words:

"that the degree of confinement to which they were subjected was so severe as to be liable to injure their health, that the confinement was more stringently solitary than any solitary confinement imposed under the Prisons Act or under Jail regulations,—both of which were limited strictly to seven days. I submitted this report deliberately with intent to force a crisis which must result either in my removal (which I did not anticipate) or in some amelioration of the cruelties I was ordered to inflict."

Cruelties were *ordered* to be inflicted. Then, Sir, this gallant Colonel, to whom I offer my tribute of praise and admiration for his high sense of duty, his large humanity and his great courage, has given us copies of correspondence which passed between him and his Government. They are all in that confidential volume. When he submitted his report regarding the treatment of the political prisoners in his charge to this effect, the Inspector General of Prisons, one Colonel W. Buchanan, wrote a letter, not in the official form but a letter beginning with "My dear Mulvany;" and "My dear Mulvany" was asked to "reconsider" his report:

"Please reconsider this letter. Remember it has to go to Simla, and it will rouse the Olympian wrath. The degree of solitary confinement is dictated to us by the Police . . ."

Mr. M. V. Abhyankar (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Police Government.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Let me read further on:

"I think you might so far report that the prisoners are in solitary confinement and are permitted to exercise daily and that both are cheerful and the health of neither has suffered; or words to that effect."

The next sentence is in italics in the official copy of the Report in question, which I was allowed to see for a few minutes:

"This report will go to Simla."

Therefore, the Inspector General of Prisons asked Colonel Mulvany, who was in charge of these political prisoners, deliberately to send a false report to the Government of India. In a postscript, this Colonel Buchanan actually wrote:

"If you agree, cancel your No. 4179 of 24 in your books and substitute new one — W. J. B".

We cannot help feeling that the statements made by this Government and on behalf of this Government with regard to the political prisoners are from top to bottom always false.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett, (Finance Member): Go on.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Are you over there not ashamed of this?

Mr. Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadian): He is not. He is laughing.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Are you not ashamed that this took place? It is an ugly disclosure. And then with this evidence before the Jail Committee, a white-washing committee, a lying committee, they made the following report,—relying, probably, on the secrecy of the minutes of evidence:

"These prisoners when in jail are detained in special enclosures or buildings separate from all other prisoners. They are granted such indulgence as books, writing materials, tobacco, hotel and the like, and are not subjected to any more restraint than is necessary for their safe custody. The arrangements made appear to be satisfactory, as satisfactory as is possible in the case of persons who are confined within a jail; and we received no complaints from any State prisoner regarding the treatment of the jail authorities."

The Committee which in the face of the evidence of Colonel Mulvany could write this, without explaining away that evidence, is a lying committee (Loud Applause); and the Government which concealed this report from the public, and which, while having it all the time in their secret drawers, took no steps for the amelioration of the treatment of political prisoners is a Government that is for ever condemned. (Applause.)

I will tell you, Sir, what a British officer thought of the instructions that were sent to him.

Mr. President: Order, order. The Standing Order 24 says that no speech during the debate shall exceed 15 minutes in duration.

Mr. Chaman Lall: May I point out, Sir, that on the last occasion when we moved a motion for adjournment and when your predecessor was in your place, he did allow us extra time in a matter like this. I would request you to allow a little more time.

Mr. President: Honourable Members must realise that if they are anxious to finish the discussion of this motion by 6 o'clock, they must put a restraint on themselves. I will not allow a minute longer than the prescribed time.

Mr. T. O. Goswami: Do I understand, Sir, that I have entirely exhausted my time?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member): Sir, I take the earliest possible opportunity of speaking to meet this motion as far as I can. I regret that the Honourable Member has not attempted to develop the point on which he has brought this motion, namely, the hunger-strike in the jails of Mandalay. In fact, I have not yet ascertained what his point in regard to that was. As regards the evidence which he has read out, said to have been given by Colonel Mulvany, he is perfectly correct and I lent him the book in order that he might satisfy himself of the fact that Colonel Mulvany did make those statements. They were made in the year 1915. They were made in England to the Jail Committee. He was then a retired officer and appeared before the Committee by whom he was examined, and his examination is not without interest. The remarks that my Honourable friend has been quoting are taken from the Written Statement which Colonel Mulvany submitted before the Jail Committee.

These events took place, as I have said, in the year 1915. (*An Honourable Member:* "The same Government prevailed.") And I trust will prevail for many years to come. (*An Honourable Member:* "We hope not.") These events took place in the year 1915. The evidence was given before the Jail Committee who had opportunity of testing the value of the evidence. They saw the man and were able to question him. I think it is unreasonable to expect me in the short notice that has been given me of this motion to be able to examine the papers and see what I have on record of events that took place eleven years ago. That, however, is not really essential to my argument. The Jail Committee who examined Colonel Mulvany and had their evidence before him came to certain conclusions with regard to State prisoners. I think my Honourable friend read them out, therefore I will not detain the House beyond reading out the last sentence which is as follows:

"The arrangements made appeared to us to be as satisfactory as is possible in the case of persons who have to be confined within a jail, and we received no complaints from any State prisoner regarding his treatment by the jail authorities. In many cases facilities have been provided to enable prisoners of this class to play badminton or lawn tennis."

Now in regard to that Jail Committee, some of the Members of which this House might say were Indian officials and prejudiced, there was an English officer included in it who was a man of great experience and knowledge of jails, who was not in the least likely to be misled by any representations from this Government. I refer to Mr. Mitchell-Innes a distinguished English official of considerable experience of jails. On that point they did not accept Colonel Mulvany's evidence. They did not support it, and in spite of my Honourable friend's criticism as to the nature of the Committee which he characterised in rather stronger language, than is usual in debates, there is nothing whatever in his contention on that point.

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

Moreover, Colonel Mulvany did say something more. My Honourable friend read out only a certain part of Colonel Mulvany's remarks. He did not read out this. He said:

"The arrangements made for their support are, in my opinion, adequate to the supply of their wants according to their rank in life. At least every wish expressed has up till now been gratified and both express themselves satisfied with their treatment in jail."

Mr. T. C. Goswami: That is the Report which was to be substituted. The Honourable Member had better refer to his own book. That was the report he was asked to substitute.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: That is the opinion given in writing by Colonel Mulvany. (*An Honourable Member* "Yes, which he was ordered to substitute.")

Now, the next point I have to make is that supposing the facts put forward are true, that Colonel Mulvany's contentions are correct, then what follows? It follows that at the time the Jail Committee reported, improvements had been made in the system, and the inhuman treatment—if such treatment took place, which I deny—had been removed, therefore whichever way you take it, the evidence did result in the better treatment of political prisoners, and no one is better pleased than I am at the result. But I am not on that point at all. I say that at the time this Jail Committee Report was published their treatment was good.

Now passing from that rather dead issue I come to the live issue of the present treatment of the prisoners in Mandalay Jail. As I informed my Honourable friend I had very little notice of this motion, and I at once telegraphed the Burma Government for a report and also the Bengal Government. I have not received a reply from Bengal but I have received a report from Burma but not in regard to points of detail. I have at present pending before me from these political detenus a petition in which they make certain requests. That was under my consideration long before the present motion was brought. I have written to inquire for the facts and for certain details; but there is no suggestion in the petition about ill-treatment. They have asked for certain extra payments in regard to various things but the petition does not suggest that the prisoners are being ill-treated. It is a carefully worded and carefully drawn up document and I suggest to the House for their consideration that if the petition as received contained no allegations of ill-treatment it is merely because there were no allegations to make. As I said, that petition is under my consideration and I am awaiting a full report from the Government. It will be dealt with and will receive due and even sympathetic consideration (*An Honourable Member* "What is the report from the Burma Government? May we know what it is about?") No, you may not. I am not in a position to give the House half facts. My Honourable friend pushes his intervention too far.

Mr. M. V. Abhyankar: I have evidence here that their letters are intercepted.

Mr. Chaman Lal: What does the remark of the Honourable the Home Member mean?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: As far as I can see the only question in the petition was one of financial aid or of necessary expenditure. No allegations were made of ill-treatment. They say they want a little more money for certain purposes. I have seen many demands from these persons who may have asked for a little more than is needed. But we are not here to provide for expenditure on a luxurious scale. We are to provide for expenditure on a reasonable and proper scale, and undoubtedly some of the demands are on a very high scale.

Apart from what I have said on the subject of the Jails Committee's Report, this question of political prisoners has been very much before the Government of India. We have from time to time issued rules regarding their treatment and I may explain to the House that copies of these rules are sent to every Local Government where these prisoners are confined, and therefore they must be in the hands of the Government of Burma. They were really drawn up with the object of seeing that they got reasonable exercise, games, newspapers and books. They are not, however, supplied with the *Forward* (Laughter) I see now that they are also supplied with confidential documents such as the Jails Committee's Report, and I am surprised to find that they have had access to Volume III which is not available to the public. How they got that document I am quite unable at this moment to say.

On the question of Colonel Mulvany, I have made it perfectly plain to the House what was his story in 1915; that his statements were not accepted; that Colonel Mulvany, if he effected any improvements, did good work, and as regards allegations of ill-treatment, there were no such allegations. There are gentlemen in this House who have been prisoners under Regulation III. Will they get up and say whether they received ill-treatment?

Pandit Shamlal Nehru (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural). Sometimes.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Were you a Regulation III prisoner?

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: No, but my friends were

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: The orders do require that they shall have facilities in various ways for rendering their confinement as little irksome as possible having regard to the fact that they are confined. I have never minimised to the House that to confine a man is a very serious thing, but in spite of the charges which have been brought against us, I repeat that we do treat these men in a humane manner

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Question.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Question, it may be, it is a question for the House to consider. So far there has been nothing said which can lead me to suppose that the cause of this hunger-strike is other than I have stated. Is it because we are discussing whether they should get a few rupees more? What is it?

Mr. T. C. Goswami: I suppose, I have the right of a reply

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I am placed in that position that this discussion has been raised at a time when it is almost impossible for the Government to develop its full case, and it is impossible equally for the Member opposite to develop his full case. Therefore, I think it is a matter which should not have been raised on the adjournment. I have nothing more to say.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, if I rise again to speak before this House about the prisoners detained under Regulation III of 1818, it is not because I can add anything to what has been so eloquently and feelingly stated in this House by my friend Mr. Goswami, but which from the Treasury Benches has evoked inhuman and brutal laughter, such as would only be possible in beasts, if the animal creation had any means of laughing. Sir, I use strong words because I feel strongly on this point, and when I find even Irish people in this House laughing when my friend was eloquently pleading the cause of those suffering people in the Mandalay Jail

An Honourable Member: He never said a word about it.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Still laughing, may God take away the power of laughter from you is all that I can say. Sir, it is only three or four days ago that we were divided on this question of Regulation III, and I shall not rake up that dirty question again. But from that it could be seen that the whole country was for condemning your Regulation and your actions thereunder because who were the men who voted for you? Take aside the official votes

Mr. President: Order, order, we are not considering Regulation III of 1818.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Sir, I would like to say one or two words in reply to the Honourable the Home Member when he said that the incidents which were quoted by my friend in this House referred to a time which is long, long past. When we ask for responsible government we are to get it by stages and stages of hundreds of years or thousands of years, but when the question of mal-administration crops up, 10 years is considered a long period, during which the system has so much improved that my Honourable friend the Home Member does not consider it necessary to reply about it. And not only that, but my Honourable friend the Home Member has said that he has had very short notice to reply to the question which has been raised by my Honourable friend Mr. Goswami. Still we have had it from his lips that he wired to the Government of Burma and the Government of Bengal, and has received a reply from the Government of Burma, but he would not let us know what that reply is. Now, Sir, that shows that this allegation of hunger-strike has its root in something in which the bureaucracy, or those in charge of these State prisoners, are certainly morally guilty, if not guilty in the eyes of those who happen to rule over us

Mr. S. Sadiq Hasan (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): Do you know the cause, that is what we want to know?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: So far as appears from the newspapers, it appears that they were prevented from worshipping their own gods. Sir, hunger-strike is a very serious thing. I appeal to you, the Members of the Treasury Benches, who are still laughing, to consider this matter; and I

appeal to Irishmen who may be here to remember the pathetic end of MacSwiney who closed his eyes with the vision of Free Ireland before him. Sir, if you treat such serious matters with cold indifference, all that remains for us is to file a petition before the Throne of Almighty God, care of the Home Member of the Government of India.

Lala Duni Chand (Ambala Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the motion for adjournment. I take pride in the fact that the motion has been moved by a member of the Party to which I have the honour to belong. The question before the House is whether there was justification for these political prisoners to go on hunger-strike. I look on this question from this point of view. We must necessarily start with the presumption that they had some justification to go on hunger-strike. Unless that presumption is rebutted by the Government the case for the hunger-strikers stands good. The Honourable the Home Member has admitted that he is unable to state his case. When I say this, I stand on very firm ground. Nobody goes in for hunger-striking for the sake of pleasure or luxury. When we know the political prisoners whose lives are most valuable decide to go on hunger-strike we must accept the inevitable conclusion that they must have been driven to that course, we must draw the presumption that the jail authorities are responsible for their hunger-strike and not the hunger-strikers themselves. I submit, Sir, now that the voice of the country on behalf of these unfortunate people is being stifled the jail authorities may have been encouraged by the general attitude of the country as represented in this House to force circumstances upon these prisoners which brought about such hunger-strike. The class of people, the most neglected, is the class of political prisoners; and the only way to prevent these hunger-strikes is to create a powerful voice that can be heard in this House as well as outside the House. I know in the heyday of non-co-operation when a very large number of political prisoners were sent to jail, the jail authorities would not dare to treat political prisoners in such a way that it would bring about hunger-strikes. The prisoners were treated with a good deal of consideration and even with respect. Now that the movement has subsided the jail authorities are not afraid to treat political prisoners in an inhuman manner. They must indeed have been treated in the most inhuman manner before they went on hunger-strike. And so the only way to prevent these hunger-strikes is to assert ourselves, to assert public opinion and to assert the opinion of this House. It is a matter of real shame and regret that the recent motion of my friend Mr. Amar Nath Dutt was defeated. We should not neglect these unfortunate people as we have neglected them so far. Immediately you begin to take care of the people who have suffered most in the cause of the country, the Government will change their attitude towards them. With these words I most heartily support the motion for adjournment.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I desire, Sir, to associate myself with this Resolution and I do so because I know that the feeling in regard to the treatment of those detenus is exceedingly strong in my province and I believe it is equally strong in the other provinces also. It has been asked what are the grievances? The particular grievances to which we desire to invite the attention of the Government and the attention of the public, the civilised public, outside this House and outside the cabinet of the Government of India,—what are

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

the grievances? Now, generally speaking, the Government are responsible for keeping the men whom they take into custody by mere executive order, without formulation of charge, without putting them to trial, though I know that they do bring in what evidence they have against these people before some Judges. But that is not an open trial, that is not really the kind of trial which satisfies all the conditions of open justice, all the conditions of what in the days of our youth we used to know and honour as British justice. But reasons of State compel the Government to take these people into custody, and we have to submit to it. We have asked for the repeal of this Regulation so far as the greater portion of India is concerned, so far as Bengal or Bombay or part of the Punjab—not the North West Frontier Province—is concerned. We asked for it but the Government would not listen to our request. They have defeated our motion by whatever means it may be, whether through their goodness or through our weakness. But it is reasonable to expect that they will fulfil their own promise. Did not they promise, did not they give us their word of honour, when they took these men into custody that, except in the matter of their moving about, except in the matter of their coming in contact with the outside world and possibly creating trouble for them by influencing other people, they would treat these men with the greatest possible consideration, that they would be kept exactly in the same position, that they would meet all their expenses to keep them in the position to which they were born and in which they have been living outside. They did give this promise. But what do we find now? I will not refer to Colonel Mulvany. I had the honour—yes, I say I had the honour—of being in his charge for some time and I may tell this House that Colonel Mulvany was a strict disciplinarian. The first time that I met him—he was on leave when I went in—the first time that I met him of course I saluted him in the ordinary civil way but he was not satisfied with it. He said “This is not the right way to salute me. Stand to attention.” I said “I don’t know how to stand to attention, I have never been taught”. Then he asked somebody to teach me how to stand to attention and I stood to attention. He said “All right”. I saluted him so. He was such a strict disciplinarian; and when from such a strict disciplinarian you find this confession,—I know it is 11 years since then and I will concede to the Honourable the Home Member that things have improved during these 11 years in this matter

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Which way?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: For the better, I will say that.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Question!

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I will say that treatment in jail, so far as I have been able to know from people who have been in jail, has considerably improved since I was there and since Colonel Mulvany was there. Now that is another matter.

Colonel Sir Henry Stanyon: How were you treated by Colonel Mulvany?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Nothing except this, that he wanted to impose and wanted to see to it that I observed all the rules of the game and I told him I was not going to break any rules.

An Honourable Member: But you were not a State prisoner.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I had not the honour of being a State prisoner. I was an ordinary convict, but I was a simple imprisonment man. That also must be said for Colonel Mulvany so far as his jail administration was concerned. I had eyes to see and ears to hear. He was a very strict man; and when from such a strict man you have this testimony, that it hurt his inner consciousness to see the way in which he had to deal with these State prisoners, you must agree that all is not right yet.

An Honourable Member: Was not right.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Was not right, but we will not have it that all is right to-day; we will not have it, and the Honourable the Home Member has not produced one shred of evidence to show that things have improved in regard to the treatment of these State prisoners since then. (*Honourable Members on the Government Benches:* "You have.") If we get that proof, certainly we shall accept his statement as correct, but I will not enter into that. I am going to discuss the actual grievances of the Burma detenus for which they have gone on hunger-strike. Now my Honourable friend (Mr. Goswami) had not the time to go into details. He was too much upset by the libel which Lieutenant-Colonel Mulvany had perpetrated against the British character in that frank and honest confession of his. He was too much agitated by that libel, by that exposure of British character, which he must have respected always, having been in England, having known British people and having had many many British friends, notwithstanding his political differences with the representatives of the British people in the Government of this country. He had no time to read the details of the complaints of these Burma detenus. I will cite some of these.

In the first place, they wanted to perform certain pujas. They were perfectly within their rights to demand this. Had they been living in their own homes they would have performed the Durga Puja for instance.

Honourable Members: They did.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: If you will kindly let me go on in my own way. They would have performed and they did perform the Durga Puja in jail. I will not enter into theological matters here. But it is a mere matter of humanity. You keep these men more or less in solitary confinement; you do not allow them to go to the cinema; you do not allow them to enter theatres; you do not give them those opportunities of recreations and social enjoyments, by which our common humanity is fed and nurtured everywhere. And therefore they organise among themselves in their prison home these Pujas. They asked for some money, but the Government practically refused, the money has not been forthcoming as yet. They spent money out of their own pockets and performed this Puja. Then they wanted to perform the Sarasvati Puja. They had 50 rupees with them and they wanted more. That was also denied. But this is not all. There are other things, some of these are petty things certainly. They are small pin-pricks which go to make up the real grievances, the cumulative effect of which has forced these men to take this dangerous step. What are these? When you make people feel very small by confining them to these narrow limits, they are hurt by small

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

things. Why should the Government refuse to prefix Mr. to the names of these men? If you continue this, then they will be known by numbers only, no name. They will be reduced to the position of convicts which they are not. In prison we are only known by numbers, no names. My Honourable friend the Home Member knows that a person in prison is not known by his own name but by number—103 or 104. And now you refuse to address them by their name. That was not in the bond. Then there are other things also. They want books and you refuse to grant the necessary monies. You refuse to give them the books they want. Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose has sufficient pecuniary resources to buy as many books as he wants. As the Chief Executive Officer of the Calcutta Corporation he was drawing Rs. 1,500 a month and the greater part of it was spent in buying books and in helping poor students to prosecute and continue their studies. You now refuse him a sufficient allowance to buy the books he needs; and he needs these books more in his prison-home than he ever did, perhaps outside. Outside he had the company of his friends and he had his public duties to perform. But here left to himself, alone to the alone, what can he do unless he has got a sufficient quantity of the proper kind of books to keep his mind pleasantly and usefully engaged? Their complaint is that you do not give them sufficient money to buy books. Then there is another complaint. I do not know how the Official Benches will take it, but we on this side of the House take it very seriously. We cannot tolerate any human being, be he white, brown or black, being ill-treated by another man; and when, in the presence of these State prisoners, the other prisoners are ill-treated as only persons are ill-treated in India by the jail warders and the jail officials . . . (*An Honourable Member*: "They are Indians".) Yes, certainly they are Indians. But the Indian is the hand that works this tyranny and yours is the brain that incites this tyranny. There are not only brains and hands among the revolutionaries but there are brains and hands also among the officials. I have been inside the prison and I have seen the way in which poor prisoners are treated, not as human beings, not even as cattle. They are treated as vermin, as less than human, less than even the cattle that ploughs the fields. Now, how can you expect that the humanity of these men would not rebel, at this treatment of their fellowmen, their fellow countrymen! I do not want you to interfere with your jail discipline, whatever that may mean, but I do demand that these men shall be kept away from their prison surroundings. My friend, Lala Lajpat Rai, if I am correctly informed, had a compound to himself at least as long as he was a prisoner in Mandalay and I think Lalaji will correct me if I am wrong. He had some men to take him out. He went out and he was not interfered with. He went as far as he could walk . . .

Lala Lajpat Rai (Jullundur Division: Non-Mohammadan): Leave those statements to me. I am going to make them.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Now, Sir, conditions have changed for the worse since the Lalaji was the guest of the State in Mandalay. Conditions have changed for the worse because you keep them in prison. Why don't you keep them outside prison walls? Why don't you provide for their detention in places where they will not have to suffer mental and moral agony at the sights that they are forced to see inside these prisons?

Then again there are other things also, of which they complain. Now, is it a fact that it was very cold in December last in Mandalay? I will leave my Honourable friend from Burma to answer that question. Is it a fact that some of the detenus in the Mandalay Jail represented to the Superintendent, Major Sheppard, that they had not sufficient warm clothing with them? Is it a fact that their meagre clothing allowance was already exhausted? They asked the Superintendent to sanction the purchase of extra clothing required either on medical grounds or in anticipation of the sanction of the Government? Is it a fact that some of the detenus wanted extra rugs for use at night? Is it a fact that the Superintendent, Major Sheppard, did not sanction the purchase of any new clothing but offered convicts' blankets to these detenus? Is it a fact that the detenus subsequently brought the incident to the notice of the Inspector General of Prisons? Is it a fact that the Inspector General took the Chief Jailer to task for offering jail blankets to the detenus? Now, I place these facts

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member has exceeded the time limit.

Lala Lajpat Rai: Sir, it is very difficult to speak with restraint on a subject like this and I can well excuse the warmth that was introduced into this discussion by my friend Mr. Goswami. Here we are dealing with the case of a man amongst others, whom we consider to be one of the finest flowers of Indian Nationalism; whose character we consider to be one of the highest we can imagine, whose charities and benefactions extended to a very large number of people at the time he was arrested. We on this side of the House consider Subhas Chandra Bose to be incapable of doing anything mean or dishonest. When a man of that character and that kind resorts to hunger-strike we are bound to assume that there must be serious causes at the bottom of the hunger-strike, which have forced him to take that step.

Sir, I have been a prisoner under Regulation III of 1818. I have been a prisoner as a convict too, and I know how serious a thing a hunger-strike is. I have seen persons who had resorted to hunger-strike becoming almost mad and insane, and as long as I was in jail, I did my very best to prevent my compatriots from resorting to hunger-strike at all. People do not resort to hunger-strike under ordinary circumstances or as an ordinary means of having their grievances redressed. It is only in extreme cases when they find that the treatment they are subjected to is unbearable and intolerable that they resort to hunger-strike. And if a man of the culture and character of Subhas Chandra Bose can resort to hunger-strike, we are absolutely safe in presuming that there must be very serious grounds which have led him to take that serious step. Unfortunately on this side of the House we are not in possession of all those facts which have led him to take that step. Sir, you must also remember that political prisoners are not quite free—neither prisoners imprisoned under Regulation III of 1818 nor even convicts—to communicate their grievances to their relatives and friends. A great deal of secrecy is preserved about the treatment of prisoners in jails as well as in other places where prisoners under Regulation III of 1818 are confined; and therefore if no facts have been communicated by them which we could place before this House, I am not prepared to believe that no facts exist and that there is no justification

[Lala Lajpat Rai.]

for that step. At the same time I quite understand the difficulty of the Home Member too. He has challenged me to state if I was treated unhumanly. I am generally reluctant to relate my personal experiences, but challenged as I am by the Home Member, I feel I must make a departure in this case. I will relate a few incidents before this House, in order to enable them to judge how political prisoners are treated at times. Of course, I don't know about the present rules, but evidently those rules have not improved things very much. They might have done so in certain respects and they might not have done so in certain others. Speaking of the question of inhuman treatment or maltreatment, it must be understood that it varies. Much depends on individual prisoners and individual jailers. Some jailers and superintendents are very good and they give no reason for any complaint to political or other prisoners. Others are not so good. Some prisoners can put up with any kind of ill treatment and bear their grievances very patiently; some cannot. It all depends upon the attitude taken by the prisoner and the jailer. And therefore no general conclusions can be deduced from one statement or the other in a matter of this kind. But in my judgment the very fact of a man being imprisoned under Regulation III of 1818, is inhuman, absolutely inhuman. It places him at a great disadvantage with all those who come in contact with him as his jailers or as his guards. The very fact of his being imprisoned under Regulation III of 1818 without being given the opportunity of explaining his conduct, without any trial or defence, dubs him as a very dangerous prisoner; and as such certain jailers and superintendents are inclined to think that they must use every possible precaution against that man communicating with the outside world or against that man even tolerably *enjoying* his life in jail, as some of the superintendents are apt to look upon it. So they put all kinds of difficulties in the way of the prisoners and consider that any treatment is good for him. Now, Sir, let us first dispose of the present trouble. Though I am not in possession of all the facts, but judging from questions put in the Legislative Council of Bengal by various Members about the treatment of those prisoners in Burma, I have no hesitation in saying that there must be certain serious causes which have led a prisoner of Subhas Chandra Bose's character to resort to hunger-strike.

Coming to my own humble experiences, it is rather unpleasant to speak of one's own case in this connection, but as I have been challenged to do so, I will make a few statements. First of all, Sir, I want to inform the Honourable the Home Member that for six months, the period of my incarceration in Mandalay, I was not allowed a single newspaper or any other periodical. I ask this House or any civilised Government, whether to deprive a man of my status and position in life, of my habits, of newspapers or magazines for six months, is inhuman or not. Secondly during the whole period of my confinement I was not allowed to see any of my relatives, in spite of applications made by them both to the Government of the Punjab and the Government of Burma. I ask the Members on the other side to say whether this was inhuman or not. Even ordinary prisoners, ordinary convicts, are allowed the privilege of having visitors, but in my case the application made by my brother, a pleader, was refused. He was not allowed to come to Burma to see me. Then, Sir, my food arrangements were put in charge of the butler of the Superin-

tendent. That Superintendent at first seemed to me to be a very kindly disposed man, but he soon changed his manners, possibly under instructions of some one else. The first day he allowed me a book to learn the Burmese language, but after three or four days he came to me and said, "I am sorry I cannot allow you to learn the Burmese language." (Laughter.) That must have been done under instructions. He did not do it on his own idea. At times he appeared to be kind and at times cruel; not that he actually beat me, but he treated me like a school boy and insulted me as often as he could. He put my food arrangements in charge of a butler, and would you believe it, one day when the vegetables were rotten and bad, I did not eat them, and the Superintendent actually came to me without any coat or waist coat, in his sleeves, and rebuked me and threatened me with dire consequences if I ever again refused to eat the food given to me. On another day, I put him a question as to whether the Government of India were still at Simla, because I was entertaining some hope of being released by the Government of India before they left Simla. He simply came down on me. How dare I ask him such a question. Well, I put up with all that without making a complaint to any one because I have made it a rule of my life not to complain of things like that. I take them as a part of the day's work. But because I made no complaint and informed no one, it does not follow that I was not treated improperly or inhumanly. I will just tell you one more funny story showing how political prisoners are guarded and treated. One day at about five o'clock in the morning, I was sitting up in bed and some Sikh passing along the road running by my bungalow was reciting the *Japji Sahib*, which is their religious prayer. My guard consisted of Burmese and Europeans; no Hindus or Muhammadans were allowed to approach my bungalow or to be a part of my guard lest I might speak with them for a minute or two. By the by, was that humane? The object was to shut me out of all association with my fellow men—with men whose language I could speak and understand. So when the Sikh Jat passed by my bungalow reciting his *Japji* rather loud, the European sergeant in charge who could not understand the language of *Japji*, came to me and asked me why I was talking to him. When I told him that I was not talking to him at all, he became very threatening and rebuked me severely. I reported this incident next day to the Superintendent, but he passed it off as if it was nothing. Instances of that kind can be multiplied by tens and twenties and I may tell the Honourable Member that however good his own intentions or the intentions of his Government may be, there are subordinates who twist those intentions into something else, who presume from the very nature of the fact that a man is imprisoned under Regulation III of 1818 that he must be a dangerous man and is not entitled to courteous treatment. They care not either for your intentions or for the position or the comfort of the prisoner. My friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal was saying something about my walks. I wish he had had the privilege of having those walks. Every time I went out for a walk I was accompanied by a guard of two constables and one European sergeant, all with loaded revolvers. If any Indian saw me on the road and had the courtesy to *salaam* me, as many did, they were punished, sometimes they were severely dealt with even before my eyes. On that account those walks were at times a regular torture to me. Sir, I feel I must stop the recitation of the wrongs done to me during my confinement. The few incidents among many more of the kind, related by me, are quite enough for the purposes of the challenge given to me by

[Lala Lajpat Rai.]

the Honourable the Home Member. Now I leave it to the Honourable Members on the other side to imagine the feelings of an educated man placed in that situation.

So, I would beg of the Honourable Members on the other side not to presume that these men, who are all men of culture and education and position, could have gone on hunger-strike for some petty or trivial reasons. We cannot of course give them all the facts, under the circumstances and at this distance. It is for the Home Member to make inquiries, and I am perfectly certain that he *will* make an inquiry. I have no doubt about that. He has said so himself. He said that he was in communication with the Government of Burma. But at the same time all that we wish to do is to draw the attention of the country to the serious state of things that exists in Mandalay jail in regard to these prisoners. And also to show, as we have been pointing out from time to time, that as long as this Regulation III of 1818 remains on the Statute-book, it will be a constant source of irritation to the whole population of India, to the people who are arrested under it, to their friends, and to the general public.

For these reasons, Sir, I support the motion made by my Honourable friend, Mr Goswami.

Several Honourable Members: I move that the question be now put.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes (Member for Commerce and Railways). Sir, I desire to congratulate my Honourable friend on the moderation of his speech. But he accused the Government of inhuman treatment in regard to political prisoners. I think, Sir, that my Honourable friend will admit that we were not altogether inhuman towards him. I remember, Sir, not very long ago being consulted by my Honourable friend, the then Home Member (Sir Malcolm Hailey), about the release of Lala Lajpat Rai. My Honourable friend at that time, we were informed, was suffering from a very severe disease, and I am sure, Sir, that I have all my friends behind with me when I say that I congratulate the Honourable Member and the House on his recovery from that disease (Applause.) Sir, I am also obliged both to Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai for having brought this debate down to the real facts. We are not, Sir, discussing this letter of Colonel Mulvany. What we are discussing is the question of this hunger-strike of these prisoners in the Mandalay Jail. Now, Sir, I think that I can fairly state that my Honourable friends opposite are in exactly the same difficulty as my friend, the Home Member, who said that he was in a difficulty in replying to this debate because he had not the information. I think that Lala Lajpat Rai and all other Honourable Members opposite are in exactly the same difficulty. What do we know about the facts of this hunger-strike? We are told that these political prisoners have been ill-treated. There is not one word of evidence to corroborate that.

An Honourable Member: We have the fact of the hunger-strike.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: True we have also their own statements. The only thing that we know is that they are in dispute with the Burma Government over allowances for the cost of certain festivals. All that my Honourable friend Lala Lajpat Rai could say was that we

must assume that there was some serious cause for this hunger-strike. Surely, Sir, the obvious thing to do would have been to wait till my Honourable friend could have found out the cause of the strike, and my Honourable friends opposite might have done the same. Then Lala Lajpat Rai gave certain of his own experiences when he was in detention in Mandulay, I think about 1907. That, Sir, is 19 years ago, if my arithmetic is correct, and I think that we can claim on this side of the House that we have made very real improvements in our treatment of these political prisoners. Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal also made certain statements. One of his complaints was that these prisoners are not allowed to go to the cinema. I am quite prepared to admit that they are not allowed to go to the cinema, but I find that they are allowed to play chess, cards and even dice, and I find also, and I am sure this will interest Honourable Members, that they are allowed the use of the *charika* and to play badminton. Lala Lajpat Rai when he was in jail complained that he was not allowed newspapers. I have here a list of the newspapers which such prisoners may be allowed to subscribe to "Any magazine published in Great Britain", and there is a list of 16 or 17 magazines and periodicals to which these political prisoners are allowed to subscribe.

An Honourable Member: Why don't you supply the *Forward* newspaper to the political prisoners?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: If the Honourable Member likes to know what the newspapers are, I am quite prepared to read out the list.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: There is one little point. I did not suggest that they should be allowed to go to the cinema, but I suggested that they ought to have other means of enjoying themselves and enjoying life.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am rather fond of cinemas myself, and I can quite appreciate the political prisoners' deprivation of it, but I quite understand the Honourable Member's point, and I was trying to make it plain to the House that though they are not allowed to enjoy that particular diversion, we make it our business to provide them with certain games, among which, as I say, there are chess, cards, badminton, the *charika*, etc., and that we have in the last few years made very real improvements. The whole question, Sir, comes round to this. These gentlemen have gone on hunger-strike. We do not know why. All we know is that there is a dispute about certain expenses on certain festivals. There is no jot or tittle of evidence to show any ill-treatment, and I suggest that this House, instead of moving what is a vote of censure, as this motion for adjournment will be, if carried, should drop the matter until we have made our inquiries and found out what the real trouble is. I emphasize my point that the Honourable Members opposite have no specific evidence to bring forward in support of the allegation of ill-treatment, and all that they could say is that because there is a hunger-strike, there must be some serious cause at work. We know from the history of political prisoners all over the world that a hunger-strike is a device in order to bring trouble to the Executive. As far as we know, the only cause here is this dispute about allowances, and I submit that there is no reason why this House should pass this motion on that ground.

(Several Honourable Members moved that the question be put.)

Mr. President: The question is that the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: Mr. Goswami.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: On a point of order, Sir, has the Honourable Member the right of reply?

Mr. President: He has. Will the Honourable Member quote any authority from the Rules or Standing Orders to the contrary?

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas (Sind: Non-Muhammadan): I also once moved that the question be put, and Sir Frederick Whyte told me that the person who had proposed the adjournment motion had the right of reply, although the House had voted that the question be put.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. Jinnah replied on the motion for adjournment in connection with the Currency Commission.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): The rule is clear and applies to all motions—rule 82 (1).

Mr. President: There is no special procedure prescribed governing the right of reply in regard to motions for adjournment. The ordinary procedure applicable to all other motions apply to motions for adjournment in the matter of the right of reply. I will therefore allow the right of reply to Mr. Goswami and also to the Honourable the Home Member.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: I thank you, Sir, for allowing me to reply. I will make a very short reply, because it is really a cruelty, perhaps an act of inhumanity (since we have been condemning acts of inhumanity), that I am perpetrating on the Home Member, who not only confessed that he was unprepared but evidently *showed* that he had absolutely no preparation and no case at all. He asked me, why did I raise this question when I did not have all the facts of the situation? And his colleague, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes went further and said that I had no definite evidence. Now I want to ask, how am I to know, or how is any Member here to know, definitely what is happening inside the barred and bolted gates of the jail in far away Mandalay. This motion is raised at least 4 or 5 days after the hunger-strike was commenced. It is for the Home Member to give us definite news. The news that there was a hunger-strike in Mandalay Jail came on

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: It may be over by now.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: The Home Member was at liberty to tell us that, if it was true; and I think the Honourable the Commerce Member will at least give me the credit for having done one thing. The first time I heard about this incident, I placed the full telegram, which contained other things of a private character, at the disposal of the Home Member early yesterday morning, and I said to him that I was not going to move for an adjournment that day

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: That, Sir, is perfectly true, and I returned the telegram after I had used it and I did not use his private information.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Quite so. I frankly came to him and asked him, to ascertain the facts. Certainly he could have sent a clear the line telegram to Burma, as the Government can always do; and during the last thirty hours the Home Member had ample opportunity of hearing from them

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I have had a reply, Sir, but I wanted a full reply.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: But you have not disclosed the reply. Is it so damaging? What I wish to say is that both the Home Member and the Commerce Member were relying on the petition of the detenus, dated the 2nd February, 1926, which no doubt related only to the dispute about the Puja allowances. But they omitted to tell us that even as late as January 16th last—I have got a copy of the petition of that date—these prisoners petitioned the Government at Mandalay pointing out various inconveniences under which they suffered; and the Saraswati Puja incident was mentioned only as one of them. They pointed out that while the Jail Committee reported—the report which I have consigned here to the floor, and there let it lay!—that these political prisoners are to be subjected to no more restraint than is necessary for their safe custody, that rule which is also enjoined by Regulation III, which is a Statute, that rule is frequently violated.

. Then, Sir, as regards Colonel Mulvany's evidence, the Home Member said that that evidence was rejected; but in the report of the Jail Committee, that Committee never took the trouble to discuss Colonel Mulvany's evidence. That is a serious point. Colonel Mulvany was responsible for looking after more internees than probably any other officer in his time; and the statement came from an authority so high as that; and the Committee, we are told, dismissed that evidence. It was certainly due not only to Colonel Mulvany, it was due to themselves and due to the public that they should have discussed that evidence, and said why that evidence was dismissed. Besides, certain letters passed between Colonel Mulvany and the then Inspector General of Prisons, which were published. If they were false, as I cannot believe that they were, the Committee ought to have stated that on investigation Colonel Mulvany's evidence was found to be untrue. Then, Sir, the Home Member quoted, and that was the most curious, most amusing, part of his speech—I mean no personal disrespect—he quoted from the report which was actually substituted under orders and under protest by Colonel Mulvany.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I was a little afraid that I made a mistake, but I observe that the paragraph that appears in both letters is in exactly the same terms.

Mr. L. Graham (Secretary, Legislative Department): Read paragraph (b).

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Read his letter of protest, Confidential D. O. No. 4179 (a), which is no longer confidential

I think before the Committee had any right to "disbelieve" the evidence of Colonel Mulvany, it was their duty to say plainly that they regarded

[Mr. T. C. Goswami.]

him as a liar; and if the Honourable the Home Member, who has, I understand, no personal experience of dealing with internees and who was not a jail official in Colonel Mulvany's time or at any subsequent time, and, so, could not claim personal experience,—I say, if he is prepared to state that this responsible official of Government, to whose high character and courage I again pay a tribute, was a liar, he is welcome to do so. Meanwhile Colonel Mulvany's evidence is there.

Now, I shall finish with one observation, and that is this. You detain people without even framing charges against them. Even that barbarous Regulation III which dates from a barbarous and lawless time,—even that provides that nothing should be done to the State prisoners except to see that they are safely under control, that no personal inconveniences should be caused. Knowing the present temper of the Bengal Government, which I greatly deplore, it is our fear that persons in authority in that province, persons, some of whom suffer, if, I am permitted to borrow a phrase from modern Psychology, from an "inferiority complex,"—persons who have been exasperated by the political movement, the perfectly lawful and constitutional political movement in Bengal,—have resorted to punitive and vindictive methods. Nothing convincing has ever been said on behalf of the Government to dispel the impression, which I repeat and which I believe in, that Government in Bengal have used this Regulation III and the Ordinance for vindictive purposes. Colonel Mulvany has said that the treatment sometimes meted out was "such as to drive any sensitive man insane". We know actually from the condition of some of the internees that they have become physical wrecks, that they have become nervous, and that some of them have become absolutely useless for further work. I must protest, again, on behalf of my friends behind me, against the inhuman treatment, which I assert with confidence, and about which Government have persistently shown such callous indifference.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Sir, the main point I had to make I was able to make by an interruption. In my first speech I was a little afraid I might have made a slip in quoting from the first letter. The sentence appears in both letters and my point was a perfectly good one. It is one of the things that one is doubtful of when speaking, not being like my Honourable friend a polished and accomplished orator.

Now, Sir, a good deal has been said, but I have not heard one single Member get up and say that any brutality is shown, any corporal brutality is shown. There have been charges that we have denied prisoners mental pabulum, and I admit that that may amount, in certain circumstances to a very serious deprivation. Perhaps to a man fond of literature, like my friend opposite, it is a more painful thing than an actual blow. My Honourable friend Sir Charles Innos has answered that objection by pointing out that the detainees can choose from a large list of magazines, but he forgot to add, no doubt through oversight, that a paper that is well known in this House, the *Bengalee*, is available to them. I may also point out that the *Englishman* and the *Statesman* are also available.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammedan Rural): That is poison to political prisoners.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Poison? My Honourable friend's opinion is different to mine as to suitable mental pabulum for political prisoners. I am not, Sir, prepared to go into the respective suitability of the various newspapers that circulate in India as to whether or not they are good pabulum for political prisoners. One point, at any rate one grievance under which my friend opposite suffered, has been remedied. Then, Sir, the point has been made and very carefully made by my Honourable colleague—and I am much obliged to him for making it; it was not open to me to make in detail as no case had then been developed—my colleague pointed out and pointed out with force that as far as we know the hunger-strike is due to the dispute as to certain allowances. That is the point that was raised in a petition which is now pending before me and on which I have asked for further information. I do not think that on that the House has made out any case for the adjournment. The main proposition which lies behind this motion is that prisoners in these days are being treated with inhumanity. I deny it, I deny it with all the force at my command. It is impossible—and here I agree with my Honourable friend Lala Lajpat Rai—it is impossible for any Government to be sure that all subordinates are behaving properly. Indeed it is not only in jails but in other parts of India that rudeness and incivility are experienced. It is a matter in our own common knowledge, equally in your own and mine. I say on the broad issues nothing has been established against Government and the House ought to support Government in this matter.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—57.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
 Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Khan Bahadur.
 Ariff, Mr. Yacoub C.
 Chaman Lall, Mr.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Deshmukh, Mr. R. M.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Ghulam Abbas, Sayyad.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Ismail Khan, Mr.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kasturbhai Lalbahai, Mr.
 Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hosain.
 Lajpat Rai, Lala.
 Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
 Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Mr.
 Majid Baksh, Syed.

Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
 Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
 Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Sayad.
 Mutalik, Sardar V. N.
 Narain Dass, Mr.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Noogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
 Piyare Lal, Lala.
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. O. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Sadiq, Hasan, Mr. S.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
 Setalvad, Sir Chimanlal.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Talatuley, Mr. S. D.
 Tok Kyi, U.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Vishindas, Mr. Harchandrai.
 Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—40.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Bajpai, Mr. R. S.
 Bhore, Mr. J. W.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Bray, Sir Denys.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Donovan, Mr. J. T.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J.
 Gordon, Mr. R. G.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hayman, Mr. A. M.
 Hezlett, Mr. J.
 Hindley, Sir Clement.
 Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur
 Captain.
 Hudson, Mr. W. F.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Jatar, Mr. K. S.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy. •

Macphail, The Rev. Dr. E. M.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
 Nath.
 Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
 Alexander.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
 Saiyid.
 Naidu, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Neave, Mr. E. R.
 Owens, Lieut.-Col. F. C.
 Rahman, Khan Bahadur A.
 Roffey, Mr. E. S.
 Sim, Mr. G. G.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.
 Vernon, Mr. H. A. B.
 Vijayaraghavacharyar, Sir
 Tiruvalangadi.
 Wajihuddin, Haji.
 Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the
 26th February, 1926.

